

Emily Höckert

ETHICS OF HOSPITALITY

Participatory Tourism Encounters
in the Northern Highlands of Nicaragua

Acta Universitatis Lapponiensis 312



Emily Höckert

ETHICS OF HOSPITALITY

Participatory Tourism Encounters
in the Northern Highlands of Nicaragua

Academic dissertation
to be publicly defended with the permission
of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Lapland
in lecture room 3 on 14 November 2015 at 12 noon



LAPIN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF LAPLAND

Rovaniemi, Finland 2015

University of Lapland
Faculty of Social Sciences
Multidimensional Tourism Institute (MTI)

© Emily Höckert

Cover: Sanni Harju

Cover image: The Joys of Coffee by José Luis Alvarado Namoyori
jla.namoyori45@gmail.com
Reproduced courtesy of GINA Gallery of International Naïve Art Ltd.
255 Dizengoff Street, Tel Aviv 6311709, Israel
www.ginagallery.com

Layout: Taittotalo PrintOne

Sales:

Lapland University Press
P.O. Box 8123
FI-96101 Rovaniemi
Tel. +358 40 821 4242
publications@ulapland.fi
www.ulapland.fi/lup

University of Lapland Printing Centre, Rovaniemi, Finland 2015

Printed:

Acta Universitatis Lapponiensis 312
ISBN 978-952-484-855-8
ISSN 0788-7604

Pdf:

Acta electronica Universitatis Lapponiensis 180
ISBN 978-952-484-856-5
ISSN 1796-6310

To my daughter, Elsa

ABSTRACT

In recent decades, the idea of community participation has played an important role in the search for sustainability, solidarity and inclusion in tourism development. The concept of participatory development has evolved in the course of rich and contradictory discussions on good life, democracy and colonialism towards a vision of alternative and small-scale tourism development, especially in the case of economically marginalized communities. This is the situation in Nicaragua, where the rapid growth of international tourism has encouraged government officials, development practitioners and researchers alike to explore and enhance the opportunities for rural tourism development through social projects. To be sure, the initiatives and guidance for community participation commonly come from the outside, from guests. While criticism of and scepticism about the real possibilities of participatory approaches in tourism have grown steadily, the academic literature has paid only cursory attention to the ideologies, values and ontologies underlying the idea of participation as such.

The research journey described in the thesis is a search for ethics in tourism settings. The study analyses participatory tourism encounters between rural communities and tourism experts, drawing on postcolonial critique and hermeneutic phenomenology. Encounters are defined here as spaces and liminal spheres between people in which the conditions of participation become negotiated. The scientific purpose of the study is to deconstruct and envision alternatives to participatory encounters through the notion of hospitality. To this end, the research follows Jacques Derrida's and Gayatri Spivak's call to question whether our ways of knowing and being in the world, such as the Western episteme and Western metaphysics, are universal and natural. The theoretical approach builds on Emmanuel Levinas' thought on ethics of hospitality, which invites one to envision ethical subjectivity as responsibility and receptivity towards 'the Other'. Situating the idea of participation at the intersection of intersubjectivity, hospitality and ethics, the study asks: How do self and other, or hosts and guests, welcome each other in participatory tourism encounters?

The empirical dimension of the research includes a longitudinal ethnographic study on rural tourism development in Nicaragua, based on three field visits

between 2007 and 2013. The research material was produced through semi-structured interviews and participatory observation in four coffee-cultivating communities in the country's northern highlands, and at the offices of the international aid organizations, NGOs and the Nicaraguan tourism ministry. In order to focus on the relations between rural communities and tourism experts, the analysis of the data was guided by the methodological discussions in hermeneutic phenomenology. This process combined both a holistic and selective reading of the data to explore how the informants described, experienced, and gave meanings to the encounters that took place in rural tourism settings.

The experiences from Nicaragua indicate that tourism experts tend to celebrate what they see as the ease of tourism development, along with the unconditional hospitality conventionally ascribed to rural areas, as a recipe for success. While the possibilities, conditions and risks of welcoming tourists become continuously shaped in various encounters between hosts and guests, guests regularly overlook or romanticize the historical, social and material experiences of the people living in host communities. The analysis indicates that despite – or actually because of – emancipatory intentions to help the local hosts, tourism experts end up dominating the spheres of dialogue. The study argues that instead of discussing the relational mode of participating – being, doing and knowing together – both practical and scholarly debates have paradoxically celebrated the individual free subject as the protagonist of inclusion and social justice.

In this light, the study proposes that moving towards more inclusive and hospitable spaces of participation requires a readiness to interrupt self as an individually responsible subject. The research contributes to the streams of tourism studies which call attention to other-orientedness in social relations. The results can be applied as a source of encouragement to decolonize research methodologies, promote participatory projects and develop pedagogical approaches that keep the door open to the unpredictable and the unexpected. Perhaps the most salient contribution of the study is that it provides a conceptual tool to facilitate reflection on alternative ways of doing togetherness.

Keywords: tourism, hospitality, community participation, encounter, ethics, intersubjectivity, hermeneutic phenomenology, postcolonial critique, Nicaraguan Highlands

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	4
PREFACE	9
1 INTRODUCTION	17
1.1 Welcome to the coffee trails of Nicaragua.....	19
1.2 On community participation in previous tourism research ..	26
1.3 Hospitality as a means and goal of the study	36
1.4 Methodology and data	45
1.5 Structure of the study	51
2 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	57
2.1 Genealogy of participation in development theories.....	60
2.2 Inclusion of local communities in tourism development	69
2.3 Hosts and guests in participatory tourism development	81
3 HOSPITALITY AS OPENNESS TOWARDS THE OTHER	91
3.1 Realms of hospitality	93
3.2 Double law of hospitality	102
3.3 Subject as welcome	111
3.4 Unlearning the privilege to enter	120
3.5 Ethical encounters at home	130
4 HOSPITABLE METHODOLOGIES	137
4.1 Decolonizing methodologies.....	139
4.2 Strange encounters in ethnographic settings.....	149
4.3 Hermeneutic phenomenological analysis	165
4.4 Epistemic violence of representation.....	173
5 UNCONDITIONAL WELCOME OF TOURISM TO NICARAGUA ..	181
5.1 Exclusive forms of hospitality	186
5.2 All-inclusive models of rural tourism.....	202
5.3 Cautious words of welcome in rural communities	216
5.4 Risks of welcoming	228

6	NEGOTIATING THE CONDITIONS FOR RURAL HOSPITALITY	231
6.1	Commodification of domestic hospitality	234
6.2	Reaching the readiness to welcome	242
6.3	Visits of the tidy guests	253
6.4	Missing encounters	266
6.5	Responsibilities of welcoming	278
7	ENVISIONING HOSPITABLE ENCOUNTERS	282
7.1	Tranquility at home	286
7.2	Continuum in teaching and learning	296
7.3	Learning anew the welcome of the other	303
7.4	Towards mutual welcoming	310
8	CONCLUSION	313
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	337
	APPENDICES	368

PREFACE

It was early July in Finland, and most people were escaping from the cities to begin their summer holidays. My then three-year-old daughter was enjoying time at our summer cottage with her grandparents. I had decided to dedicate myself to work for one more week, and continue writing the last analytical chapter of this book. After a few days of writing in solitude, I jumped on a bicycle and decided to go visit my grandparents. It was a spectacular summer evening and the sun was shining warmly even though it was already seven o'clock. Not warning them about my coming, I took for granted that they would be happy to receive me: this must be one of the great things about being a grandchild. They received me with happy faces as always, but Grandma was worried – as always – that she did not have anything to offer their surprise guest.

While Grandma was filling the table with wine, cheese and different sorts of cookies and pastries, Grandpa asked me how it was going with my research. I answered that I was actually really enjoying the opportunity to dwell on the theoretical discussions on hospitality, but that I was already longing to start the holidays with my family. I said that for me it would be great to hear how they understand the concept of hospitality and what hospitality as an idea means to them. Grandma looked at the kitchen table and pointed out how on the west coast of Finland, where we were, the main requirement for hospitality was to serve good food and drink to guests. Grandpa and I laughed and agreed that hosts were often very focused on feeding their guests. However, Grandpa continued by suggesting that, in his opinion, hospitality was not only a duty of the hosts; the guests also had a responsibility to be hospitable towards the hosts. He used our discussion as an example and argued that I was being a hospitable guest as I was interested to hear their ideas about hospitality. For me, that very moment included a glimpse of ethical encounters: we had been ready to interrupt ourselves, we were sharing our time, and we were open towards each other. On my way back a few hours later on my bike, I was smiling, thinking about the irony of having travelled all the way to Nicaragua to find out something I could have asked my own grandparents about.

At the same time, without engaging in this research on rural tourism development in Nicaragua, I probably would not have become interested in the different ways people welcome each other. What is more, during my three field visits to Nicaragua between 2007 and 2013, I constantly asked new questions about the possibilities and challenges related to rural tourism encounters. On the broadest level, this research journey could be described as a search for ethical encounters in the context of tourism development. Based on previous discussions in cultural studies of tourism, one of the best settings to identify responsible host-guest relations is in small-scale tourism initiatives based on active local participation.¹ In these discussions the starting point for tourism development lies squarely in the well-being of those being visited instead of in promoting the tourism industries as such. In recent decades there have been calls for community participation as an alternative way to develop tourism, yet research in that vein has largely remained a counter-discourse to more business-, resource- and performativity-oriented tourism studies.²

It is clear that the notion of community participation is deeply ideological, reflecting the beliefs derived from social and political theories about how societies should be organized and how development should take place.³ Moreover, the interest in the potentialities of community participation can be interpreted as a sign of people growing tired of competition, consumption and weakened social relations in contemporary societies. As solidarity and communality are often described as virtues that have been lost in the midst of urbanization and technological development, it is hardly a coincidence that travellers, tourism researchers and development practitioners have sought these values in economically marginalized rural villages around the Global South. In most cases this means experiencing, studying or promoting community participation somewhere far away from one's physical home.

1 Singh, Timothy & Dowling 2003; Tosun 2005; Smith, M. K. 2009; Höckert, Hakkarainen & Jänis 2013; Jamal & Dredge 2014.

2 Saarinen 2006; For more discussions on the business orientedness of tourism studies, see Ayikoru, Tribe & Airey 2009; Tribe 2009, 41; Pitchard, Morgan & Ateljevic 2011; Caton 2012.

3 Midgley 1986, 4; 2011; James Midgley's discussions on local participation have previously been acknowledged by tourism researcher Cevat Tosun 2000.

Continuing the tradition of community case studies in tourism research⁴, my study includes a longitudinal ethnographic study in the coffee-cultivating communities of San Ramón, in the northern highlands of Nicaragua. Nicaragua is a country with a strong history of cooperative movements and resistance against foreign invasions, which makes it an interesting case for studying how local participation is supported by foreign and external actors. The research is driven by curiosity regarding the assumption that the people living in rural communities welcome all kinds of guests unconditionally. Hence, the purpose of the study is not to describe how the members of rural communities ‘do’ participation among themselves, but to train the focus on the host-guest relations in supposedly participatory tourism encounters. The research journey begins in the year 2007, when I lived in Nicaragua for the first time, mixing the roles of tourist, development practitioner and master’s student in tourism research. I think that conducting a longitudinal study has given me a great opportunity to reflect on my own preconceptions about academic research, international development cooperation and, most of all, the ‘other’.⁵ My sincerest wish is that by telling the story of my research, this book can help us to reflect on not only how we relate to others, but also how we relate to ourselves.

Doing this research has given me the privilege of meeting, and enjoying the support of, many wonderful people. It is all these encounters which have made it possible and meaningful for me to complete this book. First of all, I am enormously grateful to the people in San Ramón who opened their homes to me, treated me as a friend, took the time to answer my questions and challenged me with theirs. I also would like to thank all the development practitioners, government workers, civil society activists and university professors and students who participated in my study in Nicaragua during the past years – and even those who decided to keep their doors closed.

4 For research on community-case studies in tourism, see Dredge & Hales 2012; Dredge, Hales & Jamal 2013.

5 I have chosen to use the lowercase spelling of ‘other’ in the expression the ‘other’ unless there is a clear reason to use the capitalized form, for example, a quotation from Levinas. The complexity of this issue is obvious as even Levinas’ own texts include contradictory ways of capitalization and non-capitalization (see also Kallio-Tavin 2013, 25).

Special thanks are due to Flora O. Acevedo, Óscar Danilo Barrera Pérez, Olga Gómez, Catriona Knapman and Andrea Siclari for sharing their valuable insights on rural tourism development in the country. Working at the Finnish Embassy in Managua in 2007-2008 provided an excellent kick-start for this research, and I hope that Damaris Diaz, Tiina Huvio and Elina Sana know how crucial their help and guidance were to me.

It is impossible to put in words how indebted I am to my world-class supervisory committee for believing in me. Soile Veijola has been a continuous source of inspiration, ambition, encouragement, guidance and empathy since the very beginning of this research process. Thanks to Soile's way of posing challenging questions and of being quite obsessed with the table of contents, I was able to understand and articulate what this research is actually about. My wholehearted thanks also go to Suvi Ronkainen, whose generous and detailed comments on my manuscript in its later stages gave positive and much-needed boosts to this project and offered me a better understanding of different approaches in ethnographic research. Likewise, I would like to thank Jussi Pakkasvirta, from the University of Helsinki for welcoming me to join the POLITOUR research project (Policies and Practices of Tourism Development in Central America), financed by the Academy of Finland in the years 2011-2014. I am very happy that my research journey has been accompanied by Jussi's continuous support and remarkable knowledge about the Central American context.

I will always remember the conference *Critical Tourism Studies* in Cardiff in 2011, which I attended as a "pristine" PhD student. Amongst the most memorable presentations in this conference were those of Kellee Caton and Tazim Jamal, where the organizers had to bring more chairs into the overcrowded lecture hall. While I was truly inspired by their wisdom and humanity, I could never have imagined that four years later I would have the privilege to send my manuscript to these two brilliant scholars. Thank you for agreeing to be my examiners and for providing me with constructive comments that have helped me to clarify my arguments and finish my book. Both Jamal and Caton encouraged me to strive for greater clarity in the sections where I discussed Emmanuel Levinas' thought on welcome. I am extremely grateful for Jamal's insightful remarks on Levinas' work that

challenged me to deepen my analysis while keeping in mind the asymmetry of welcoming. Likewise, I am truly delighted by the way in which Caton engaged in a dialogue with my research and gave me many new ideas and much fresh inspiration for my future work.

I am indebted to the tourism research community at the Multidisciplinary Tourism Institute (MTI) of the University of Lapland for making me feel at home in Rovaniemi. It has been invigorating to follow the example of your critical scholarship and I hope that you all know how much your encouragement and friendship mean to me. For inspiring discussions and top-notch teamwork, I would like to thank in particular José-Carlos García Rosell, Minni Haanpää, Maria Hakkarainen, Heli Ilola, Monika Lühje and Outi Rantala. Extra hugs and thanks go to Maria for our performances in duets. I would also like to extend particular gratitude to the director of MTI, Johan Edelman, for supporting my work in multiple ways and for providing a truly multidisciplinary learning environment where scholars encourage and respect each other. Warm thanks also go to all the fellow doctoral students who have helped me to bounce around ideas at the doctoral seminars organised by MTI and the Faculty of Social Sciences. Above all, I am grateful to Suvi Alt, whose critical yet constructive comments advanced my study immensely.

I am grateful to the Academy of Finland, the University of Lapland and the Finnish Concordia Fund for financing my research. Most of all, I am thankful for the 3.5-year funding grant from the Academy of Finland which made it possible for me to conduct multidisciplinary research in cooperation with different academic communities. I am thankful to my co-researchers Florencia Quesada and Katri Onnela at the POLITOUR research project for their help and insightful discussions on research methodologies and tourism development in Central America. I would also like to express my gratitude to the researchers and students in Development Studies at the University of Helsinki for welcoming me and to thank Anja Nygren in particular for her thought-provoking comments and understanding during the doctoral course. I feel very privileged to have met such devoted scholars and inspiring friends in the department; sincerest thanks are due to Henni Alava, Maylin Meince, Henri Onodera, Katono Ouma, Liina-Maija Quist, Eija Ranta and Ilona Steiler. Special thanks to Julia Jänis for the enjoyable

and motivating co-writing experiences. I also would like to thank Jeremy Gould for his support during the courses organized by the Finnish Graduate School in Development Studies (DEVESTU).

Since the first chapter of this book, it becomes obvious that without one particular writing camp near Pyhätunturi Fell in Finnish Lapland in February 2013, my book would probably have turned out to be something quite different. I am grateful to Soile Veijola and Jennie Germann Molz, among others, for bringing together a wonderful community of people who participated in and contributed to *Camping Together: A Tourist Experiment in Post-Biopolitical Living*. This unique camping and writing experience allowed me to dive into fascinating discussions on hospitality, relational ontologies and good life with bright and fearless academics like Soile, Jennie, Tim Edensor, Alexander Grit, Olli Pyyhtinen and Gavin Urie. Thank you one more time.

It also merits mention that the ideas presented in this book have been greatly improved thanks to many students, journal editors, reviewers and conference and symposium participants. Special thanks in this regard go to Sarah Becklake, Rouven Dorian, Dianne Dredge, Szilvia Gyimóthu, Sandra Harding, Lisa Maria Jokivirta, Lynn Minnaert, Dieter Müller, Julian Reid, Juulia Räikkönen, Jarkko Saarinen, Seija Tuulentie and Jarno Valkonen.

I have also received crucial help in the concrete process of turning the manuscript into a book. First of all, I feel privileged that Richard Foley helped me with language editing and formulating my ideas as clearly as possible. Working with such a dedicated practitioner turned the entire finalizing process into a treat. It has also been a delight to work with Paula Kassinen at Lapland University Press: thank you for your faith in and patience with me. Furthermore, thanks to Taittotalo PrintOne for taking such a good care of my manuscript. I am also very grateful to Sanni Harju for the thoughtful discussions and for the hours of work she put into the graphic design of the book. Warm thanks are also in order to José Luis Alvarado Namoyori in Masaya, Nicaragua, for giving me permission to use his painting *The Joys of Coffee* on the cover page. I would also like to say how thankful I am to my aunt Kaisa-Liisa Puonti for proof-reading earlier versions of my texts and for always showing interest in my research.

During this journey I have enjoyed the outstanding hospitality of very many friends and family members. You all know who you are – thank you! Commuting from Stockholm to Helsinki became not only possible, but also so much more fun, because of my sister and her family: Iida Höckert, Eeka and Jani Torkko. Thank you for everything. I also would like to say a big thank you to Kaarina Mäcklin’s family in Rovaniemi, who have always welcomed me with open arms. During my most recent visits to Rovaniemi I have also had a chance to enjoy the lovely company of my brother Mikko Höckert and Jenni Kalaoja. Whole-hearted thanks go to Þóra Bjarnadóttir, not only for sharing her home with me in Nicaragua and in Iceland, but for being such a close friend since the first day we met. I am deeply grateful to Damaris and Rafael Diaz in Managua for welcoming and caring for me and my family: there could be a thick book written about your genuine hospitality. Likewise, my warmest thanks go to Riikka Raatikainen, Atahuallpa Mejia, Jaakko Jakkila and Tzitzí Caldera for all the great memories and for taking care of me the last time I visited in Nicaragua, in 2013. This research project has also given me chances to visit the Pospissil-Reichmann family in both the US and Brazil: thank you for sharing your hospitality and joy of life.

However, writing a dissertation on ethical encounters, participation and hospitality has also meant, paradoxically, closing myself up at home alone and avoiding interruptions from the outside world. I am thankful to all those who have allowed me to do this, and even more to those who have continued to knock on my door and to welcome me back. I feel truly privileged to have such wise and kind-hearted friends as Maria, Matthias, Charlie and Theodor Bergerlind Dierauer, David Faltén, Alejandra Ganem-Cuenca, Karin Henningsson and David Lindell. Thank you all for always being there for me and my family. I also want to thank Ella, Signe, Lina and Fredrik Kron for all their help and friendship during the last, far too hectic phases of writing this book. Warm hugs and thanks are also due to my dear friend Satu Väistö for sharing the ups and downs of trying to combine family life with academic research. My gratitude also goes to family and friends in Tärnaby who have helped me to find a better balance between writing and relaxing: I started to write all your names here, and was happy to notice that the list would have been far too long. However, I want to direct my special

thanks to Charina and Conny Hedlund for welcoming me into the family and for offering me support in so many different ways.

It would be fun to deliver the next round of thanks riding on a bicycle around my hometown on the west coast of Finland. The first stops would be at my grandparents' and godparents' houses, where I would say thanks to them for supporting and feeding my creativity ever since I was little. I should then definitely stop by Anu Kiilholma's home and tell her how great it was to grow up with such a good and sympathetic friend. After that I would meet up with Riikka Turtiainen and Emma Niemi by the football field, where I would thank Riikka for encouraging me to take my first steps as a researcher and Emma for having the interest to travel all the way to Nicaragua to check out what my research was about. I would then return the bike to my parents, Elina and Harri Höckert, and thank them for visiting us in Nicaragua not only once, but twice.⁶ Mom and Dad, I am immensely grateful for your selfless, never-ending support for my ideas and choices: you are number one when it comes to parenting.

My absolutely greatest gratitude and admiration go to Christofer Hedlund: this journey would not have been possible without your adventurous mind, friendship, support, patience and healthy dose of sarcasm: *Tack*. I cannot imagine a bigger joy in life than being with you and our beautiful little Elsa – my home is wherever I am with you.

On a great day at Tärnaby's windmill, 16 October 2015

Emily

6 I am happy that you returned even though after the first visit I sent with you an overweight suitcase full of tourism research literature.

1 INTRODUCTION

During my first visit to Nicaragua in 2007-2008, the questions of participatory development and democratic decision making were as topical and disputed as they can be. Nearly thirty years had passed since the legendary Sandinista revolution and the supposedly leftist Sandinistas had just returned to power after an era of more right-wing governments. The streets were filled with big pink posters which celebrated the new president, Daniel Ortega, and his ambition of making Nicaragua ‘Christian, Socialist and in Solidarity’ again through ‘civic participation’. At the same time, the winds of change were splitting the nation and many were having serious doubts whether Nicaragua was actually moving towards more inclusive and equitable forms of progress. People were asking, with disillusionment in their voices, whether the real spirit of Sandinism and the socialist movement had become replaced by centralization of power, personal interests, and clientelism.⁷ While I was doing my internship at the Finnish Embassy in Managua, I was struck by international aid agencies’ concerns over how democracy had deteriorated in the country. It seemed like a growing number of bilateral aid organizations had begun feeling that their help was no longer valued and welcomed by the new government in power.

However, one of the few issues that the Nicaraguan government and international donors seemed to agree upon was the importance of directing funds and support to tourism development. Similarly to other countries in Central America, Nicaragua had recently been seeking, and also seeing, exponential growth in international tourism. In fact, growing foreign interest in the volcanoes, pristine beaches and colonial towns in the country was raising tourism to one of the most important sources of foreign income,

7 Equipo Nitlapan – *Envió* 2008, 3-13.

alongside coffee beans.⁸ At the same time, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in particular were directing their criticism towards the invasion of luxury resorts and residential tourism on the country's Pacific coast; in their view, it was highly uncertain who was actually reaping the benefits from the boom in the tourism sector.⁹ In response to the emerging demands for fairer forms of tourism development, the Nicaraguan government and international aid agencies began adopting rural tourism as a model for creating more sustainable forms of that development.¹⁰ The fresh policy and project documents emphasized the importance of developing tourism based on local control, participation, ownership, empowerment, micro and small enterprises and wider distribution of benefits.¹¹ This led to a situation where many of Nicaragua's rural tourism initiatives were founded as social projects, with a considerable influx of funds from international donors.¹²

With my background in tourism studies, I was thrilled to read project documents and newspaper articles on rural, community-based tourism. I even received invitations to participate in seminars and conferences arranged to discuss the great potential of this kind of tourism development. I remember thinking that community-based initiatives offered a much-needed alternative to the prevailing venues of tourism inequalities, such as all-inclusive enclave resorts¹³, displacement¹⁴, labour rights¹⁵, sexual abuse tourism¹⁶, tourism marketing¹⁷ or exploitation of natural and cultural resources¹⁸. My interest in the promise of the new kinds of tourism projects encouraged me

8 Barrera 1997; INTUR 2006, 2010a.

9 Cañada & Gascón 2007a; Bonilla & Mordt 2008; Mowforth, Munt & Charlton. 2008, 86-9.

10 UNWTO's representative María Nelly Rivas' interview in the Nicaraguan newspaper *La Prensa*, 12 December 2007.

11 SNV 2007; PEMCE 2008; INTUR 2009a.

12 Höckert 2011; Zapata et al. 2011. For a discussion about the important roles of development intermediaries in tourism, see Tosun (2005) 'Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the Developing World'.

13 Dielemans 2008; Carlisle 2010.

14 Mowforth et al. 2008; Nkyi & Hashimoto 2014, 390-1.

15 Ibid.; Cole & Eriksson 2010.

16 Veijola, no date.

17 Echtner & Prasad 2003; Hall & Tucker 2004.

18 Cole & Morgan 2010.

to research the area further. I was concerned about the ways how tourism developers were treating tourism almost as one of the ‘productive’ rural sectors.¹⁹ Accordingly, I wanted to explore how local communities might perceive the social and cultural impacts of tourism initiatives. Knowing the short life expectancy of rural tourism projects, I was interested to get to know some of the pioneering communities in the field. I had heard and read about the older tourism initiatives that contributed to the creation of the coffee route, *Ruta del Café*, in the northern highlands.²⁰

1.1 Welcome to the coffee trails of Nicaragua

In August 2008, after a three-hour bus ride from Managua and one change, I arrived in the small farming town of San Ramón. A local tourist guide came to pick me up at the bus stop and bid me welcome to the coffee trails. She was wearing a green t-shirt with the logo of RENITURAL, which stands for la Red Nicaragüense de Turismo Rural Comunitario (Nicaraguan Network for Rural Community-based Tourism). During our walk to her home community, I got to hear the entire story of tourism’s arrival, starting from the Sandinista revolution in 1979. The guide told me how in the 1980s, during the Contra war, the international solidarity movement brought the first foreign visitors to the area. At that point, tourism was not yet organized and visitors were ‘attended as friends, not as tourists’, as she put it. The first guests brought their own food and stayed with local families for free. They expressed an interest in helping, but also in learning about the collective spirit of the Nicaraguan socialist revolution and the newly founded coffee cooperatives.²¹ These types of visits, as well as different forms of unofficial help, nearly ended when the Sandinistas lost the election in 1990.

19 Shen, Hughey & Simmons 2008, 8.

20 At that time, the Nicaraguan tourism institute INTUR and the Luxembourg Agency for Development Cooperation Lux-Development were financing a five-year (2007-2011) programme known as *Ruta del Café* with the main objective of supporting local economic development.

21 Höckert 2011, 14-5.

The guide also spoke about the global coffee crisis in 2000, which had severe impacts on the cooperatives of small coffee producers in the area.²² In light of the circumstances, the regional and local coffee cooperative unions introduced the idea of beginning an official tourism programme. In addition to providing supplementary income and new contacts with coffee consumers, tourism was expected to contribute to gender equality and to create new job opportunities, especially for young people.²³ Since then, representatives of many bilateral aid organizations and NGOs, as well as students and researchers like me, had become frequent visitors to the area.²⁴ In Spanish the initiative came to be called Agro-Ecoturismo Comunitario, while English-speaking visitors preferred to call it the Fair Trade Coffee Trail.²⁵ After the walk, we arrived in a village of about forty houses, an elementary school, two kiosks and a football field. There was also plenty of tourist signage, making the community more, as tourism scholar Bella Dicks²⁶ puts it, 'visitable'. The printed and painted boards welcomed visitors to the community, indicated the houses offering tourist accommodation, showed how to get to the waterfall, the old gold mine and the scenic look-outs, helped identify the trees, explained which coffee plants are organic and provided reminders of generous donations from different aid organizations.

Less than a month after this visit, I returned to San Ramón to collect ethnographic data for my master's thesis. I conducted interviews and engaged in participatory observation with a special interest in the idea of empowerment. I was happy to hear that women and young tourist guides, the ones committed to the tourism programme, were participating in different forms of training in order 'to be able to receive guests'.²⁷ People told

22 For more information on Fair Trade Coffee certifications in Nicaraguan see Valkila 2009; Valkila & Nygren, 2009; Ganem-Cuenca 2011.

23 UCA San Ramón, Project document 2008.

24 Cañada, Delgado & Gil 2006, 56-8; Höckert 2009; Cañada 2010; Pérez, Barrera, Peláez & Lorío 2010; Zapata et al. 2011; McRoberts 2012.

25 UCA San Ramón www.tourism.ucasanramon.com, website accessed on 12 March 2015; For other studies that discuss the issue of combining Fair Trade certification and tourism, see Katajamäki 2011; Goodwin 2012; McRoberts 2012.

26 Conceptualization of *visitability* introduced by Dicks 2003.

27 See Moscardo 2008.

me that although they had felt nervous and awkward with the first ‘official’ tourists, new contacts, positive experiences and better understanding of tourism activities helped them to gain confidence and enjoy the travellers’ visits. I also heard that in the early years of tourism, the guests stayed and slept in the same rooms as their host families, whereas now there were already special rooms built for the purpose.²⁸ In my analysis I described how local communities had experienced the social and cultural impacts of tourism development as positive for the most part. I drew the conclusion that the essence of this kind of tourism could be seen in its ‘potential to promote people’s control over factors that affect their lives – in other words, to support empowerment’.²⁹

However, when I returned to San Ramón in 2012 to work on my doctoral thesis, the atmosphere with regard to tourism activities had changed. The number of visitors had declined drastically after 2008, and the host families had ended up paying back the loans they had taken for tourism development, and the interest on them, with their coffee beans. Many of the local hosts seemed upset with the development aid organizations and cooperative unions, which had advised them to take relatively big loans, called microcredits, in order to improve the accommodation they could offer tourists.³⁰ While listening to these accounts, I recalled that people had told me about their concerns over these loans already during my previous visit. However, I must have been trivializing these fears, as I was focusing on gathering tractable data.

Unlike before, I was now travelling with a smaller amount of development optimism and a bigger load of academic scepticism. This switch allowed me to notice the local communities’ resistance towards new development interventions and how weary people were of waiting for tourists who were no longer coming. Although the number of tourists had declined, development consultants, students, researchers and volunteer workers were still

28 Höckert 2009.

29 Ibid, 107; similar conclusions have been drawn by Hatton 1995, 5; Scheyvens 1999; 2002; Cole 2006.

30 For critical perspectives on the subject of micro-credits, see Hossain, Rees & Knight-Millar 2014, Hietalahti & Nygren 2014, Geleta 2015.

relatively frequent visitors in these communities. Many of them or perhaps more rightly us, were coming to help the locals to participate in tourism and community development in the right way. One of the most drastic examples had been a bilateral development aid programme called 'Moderniza', which included a great variety of different kinds of recommendations on how local families should improve their hospitality – and take new loans – in order to bring back paying customers. As a response to these modernization efforts, some of those participating in tourism development had decided that the consultants representing this particular programme were no longer welcome in their homes and home community.

I had previously travelled to San Ramón with a naïve hope of finding tourism encounters noticeably different from those in contemporary global tourism settings, that is, different from host-guest relations based upon the inequalities between the wealthy and the impoverished.³¹ However, I became frustrated and confused. Even community-based tourism, which was supposed to be based on local communities' needs, seemed to reconstruct the unequal, and uncomfortable, balances of power between the West and the rest, or the cores and the peripheries.³² Despite the principle of local participation, the problems seemed to be found in local communities, while the solutions were provided from outside. Hence, it seemed unclear whose voices were actually being heard in participatory projects. I had to admit that despite the recent celebration of local ownership, indigenous knowledges and marginality³³, even the emancipatory tourism initiatives I witnessed were struggling in changing the role of subaltern populations from objects to subjects in tourism development.³⁴ And, above all, as I will argue in more detail later, these tourism encounters lacked mutual openness; that is, they lacked hospitality.

31 Cole & Morgan 2010, xv; see also Scheyvens 2011.

32 For similar reflection on the West-Rest binaries in supposedly responsible context, see Caton's (2008) work on studying abroad via non-profit educational organizations.

33 Jamal, Everett & Dann 2003, 154; Higgins-Desbiolles 2006; Schilcher 2007, 184; Telfer 2009, 153; Pritchard, Morgan & Ateljevic 2011, 14; Zapata et al. 2011, 23.

34 Tosun 2000; Mowforth et al. 2008, 71; Saarinen 2010.

A recent comparative study from Nicaragua by María Jose Zapata, C. Michael Hall, Patricia Lindo and Mieke Vanderschaeghe³⁵ points out that the local tourism projects directed to domestic markets tended to reap benefits faster and in a more sustainable manner than those implemented using the top-down strategies of international development agencies, which reflect prevailing neo-liberal values. However, as Zapata et al.³⁶ have established, these kinds of ‘bottom-up’ initiatives are less common. This is unfortunate, and not only for ideological reasons. As shown in a growing number of studies around the world, the development of tourism for long-haul markets – without translation to the local resources available – can easily lead to a difficult dependency arising. In general, tourism initiatives often flag significantly after the withdrawal of external support.³⁷ While the focus of tourism research has traditionally been on the encounters between hosts and tourists, the definitions of success or failure of even supposedly ethical forms of tourism development seem to depend greatly on the power, goals and practices of tourism experts and intermediaries.³⁸

Bringing together cultural studies of tourism and development studies, the study at hand draws attention to the encounters between tourism experts and local communities in rural tourism settings. In addition to the empirical data I have collected in rural communities of San Ramón, I have gathered data among various tourism experts working in Nicaragua. I have chosen to use the term ‘tourism experts’ to describe guests with special insights into tourism, such as development officials, researchers and students. While acknowledging that these ‘experts’ do not form a homogenous group of actors, I must point out rural communities do not either; I consider that the experts share a common, emancipatory will to help the ‘other’. Hence, the study is driven by a curiosity to explore the following questions: Why might

35 Zapata et al. 2011.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.; Burns 2004; van der Duim et al. 2006; Barnett 2008, 38; Viswanath 2008, 47; Höckert 2009.

38 Cheong & Miller 2000; Wearing & McDonald 2002; Fennell & Przeclawski 2003; van der Duim et al. 2006, 104-123; Butcher 2007; Zorn & Farthing 2007; Mowforth et al. 2008, 70-71; Höckert 2009.

participatory tourism encounters lead to frustration and criticism among local communities, development practitioners and tourism researchers? Why do rural communities and tourism experts engage in participatory tourism development? How do the risks and responsibilities of participating become negotiated in rural tourism initiatives? In which ways can research on local participation re-construct or de-construct otherness? What would it mean to move towards more ethical and hospitable encounters? Seeking answers to these questions will then help to illuminate the question: How do self and other, or hosts and guests welcome each other in participatory tourism encounters?

The study suggests that one of the possible explanations for the frustration experienced in earlier projects lies in pre-set agendas of participation and assumptions about tourism and the 'other'. These presumptions are most likely to undermine the possibilities of establishing open communication. Postcolonial critiques in particular have called attention to the difficulty of addressing the issues of dominance and exclusion without actually perpetuating otherness and the binary oppositions between subject and object, developed and undeveloped.³⁹ By 'postcolonial criticism' I refer to that criticism in which the researcher positions herself or himself against imperialism, colonialism and Eurocentrism, as well as Western notions of philosophy.⁴⁰ Especially Gayatri Spivak⁴¹, but also other decolonization theorists, such as Walter D. Mignolo⁴², demand that we acknowledge that the privileged position which academic researchers and development consultants, among other actors, occupy is the reason why the 'locals' cannot be heard.⁴³ Instead the 'other' is always already interpreted. The consequence is 'epistemic ignorance' or 'epistemic violence': trivialization and invalidation of ways of knowing that fall outside of the West's, and the local elite's, languages, epistemic

39 Or as Hazel Tucker (2014, 199) puts it, the dualistic positions of 'tourists and toured'; for more on postcolonial critique within tourism studies, see Edensor 1998; Hollinshead 1998, 2007; Hall & Tucker 2004; Caton 2008, 2013.

40 Hall & Tucker 2004, 2-3; Eriksson Baaz 2005, 32-5; McEwan 2009, 22-3; For core 'strategies' used by postcolonial critiques, see McEwan 2009, 25-6.

41 Spivak 1988; Sharpe & Spivak 2002; see also Kapoor 2004.

42 Mignolo 2005; Mignolo & Escobar 2010.

43 See also Veijola & Jokinen 1998, 329-30.

traditions and philosophies.⁴⁴ This means, paradoxically, that those who are expected to participate might actually become silenced in encounters designed to support local participation.

Reading postcolonial philosophy, and especially Emmanuel Levinas⁴⁵ thinking on phenomenology as openness to the other, has helped me to realize how tourism development encounters include not only epistemological conflicts, but equally the potential for conflictive ontological encounters.⁴⁶ To put it differently: there are not only different ways of *knowing* but also *being* with the 'other', and 'multiple others'.⁴⁷ However, it seems like the ongoing debates on community participation in tourism, or in tourism research in general, have paid only limited attention to understanding the different foundations of the social, that is, how we welcome each other in supposedly ethical encounters. The study suggests how the contemporary search for ethics within tourism has been driven, for the most part, by self-oriented, ethno-, and Eurocentric ideas of participation and responsibility. By drawing on postcolonial and phenomenological discussions on ethical subjectivities the study aims to offer an alternative approach to analysing host-guest relations in participatory tourism settings.

Before presenting the theoretical and methodological approaches I have chosen, I take a brief look into previous academic debates on community participation in tourism research, and explain how my study is situated in, and aims to contribute to, these discussions.

44 Ibid.; Sharpe & Spivak 2002, 613; Kuokkanen 2007, 66-8.

45 Levinas presents this idea in his first major book of philosophy, *Totality and Infinity* (1961). The book was translated into English in 1969. In order to make it easier to follow Levinas' thinking, I have included his references with abbreviations such as T&I indicating the book I refer to. I have chosen to give this kind of special 'treatment' to Levinas work because his work has been published in many different forms during the past six decades. Also Derrida's *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* will be cited as 'Derrida AEL 1999'.

46 On conflictive ontological encounters, see Blazer 2010.

47 Levinas T&I 1969; O&B 1998; see also Veijola et al. 2014.

1.2 On community participation in previous tourism research

Tourism studies have been partly misled, in my view, by an impression that local participation would be a novel phenomenon in development. Therefore, I find it meaningful to recognize the important and ambiguous role of participation in different development theories. Development scholars have traced the roots of the contemporary approach to community participation to different time periods and schools of thought. These include, for instance, Aristotle's notion of 'good life'⁴⁸, community development promoted by missionaries and colonial officials⁴⁹, modernization theory⁵⁰ and the community development movement in the US and England.⁵¹ More radical roots have been located in 1960s and 1970s Latin American liberation pedagogy, dependency theory, and neo-Marxism⁵², not to forget the less-acknowledged influence of feminist theories.⁵³ However, interestingly, the existing approaches to community participation have for the most part been based on what is known as the alternative development paradigm, which emerged in the early 1980s as a response to dominant neoliberal development models.⁵⁴ After the growing body of critique towards development as an imperialist project, the idea of participation was 'discovered' in the mainstream development discourses in the 1990s.⁵⁵

Tourism scholar David Telfer⁵⁶ has highlighted the interconnections between previous development theories in development studies and the scholarly debates in tourism research. Telfer⁵⁷ shows the ways in which tourism research has also followed alternative development approaches,

48 Cohen & Uphoff 2011, 35.

49 Leal 2010, 90; Greig, Hulme & Turner 2007, 234.

50 Stiefel & Wolfe 1994.

51 Midgley 2011, 1749.

52 Stiefel & Wolfe 1994, 15-7; Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 83.

53 Maguire 2011.

54 Chambers 1983; Cornwall 2010; Telfer 2014.

55 Greig et al. 2007, 236; Hettne 2009; McEwan 2009, 256.

56 Telfer 2009; 2014.

57 Brohman 1996, 65 cited by Telfer 2014, 57.

emphasizing the themes of empowerment, small-scaleness, and locally owned development. There exists a consensus among tourism scholars that the academic discussions on participatory tourism planning were launched in 1985 by Peter E. Murphy in his book *Tourism: A Community Approach*. Although host communities had received attention even earlier⁵⁸, Murphy's research offered the first broader platform for theoretical discussions about a community's sense of ownership, feeling of responsibility and practical involvement in tourism.⁵⁹ The work has been followed by a growing body of literature posing questions of how and whether local communities should be included in development. The main themes of these studies can be divided into three groups⁶⁰: the first features ways of promoting equality within communities, socio-economic groups and regions⁶¹, the second the roles of external actors in local tourism development⁶² and the third the ways in which tourism development can shape and change local communities.⁶³ Although the studies are often located in what has become known as Global South, a growing amount of research has pointed out similar challenges and possibilities in community participation in economically marginalized areas elsewhere around the globe.⁶⁴

While the principle of local participation has maintained its key role in development discourses, in tourism research the idea of community participation has remained an unconventional and somewhat unrealistic idea.⁶⁵ One of the explanations for this must lie in the way in which development studies, in contrast to tourism research, have been built on a normative

58 See, for example, de Kadt 1979.

59 Olsen 1997; Ross & Wall 1999; Page & Dowling 2002; Boyd & Singh 2003; Simpson 2008.

60 We have previously presented this division of three main themes in Höckert et al (2013) in a chapter titled 'Local participation in rural tourism development'.

61 Scheyvens 2002; 2011; George, Mair & Reid 2009; Cole 2011; Höckert 2011; Jänis 2011; Zapata et. al. 2011; Pleumarom 2012.

62 See, for instance, Jamal & Getz 1995; Tosun 2000; Wearing & McDonald 2002; Zorn & Farthing 2006; Butcher 2009; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

63 See for instance, Young 1973; Bianchi 1999; Murphy & Murphy 2004; Kontogeorgopoulos 2005; Mettäinen, Uusitalo & Rantala 2009.

64 Popple 2000; Müller 2007; Moscardo 2008; Hakkarainen 2009; 2011; Dredge & Hales 2012; Höckert et al. 2013; Jamal & Dredge 2014.

65 Ibid.; Higgins-Desbiolles 2006; Butcher 2007; 2012; Weaver 2012.

purpose of spreading social justice.⁶⁶ In order to locate the principle of community participation within broader discussions of sustainable tourism development, I find it helpful to take a look at tourism geographer Jarkko Saarinen's⁶⁷ analysis, which identifies three distinct traditions and discourses of sustainability. According to Saarinen, the first tradition, resource-based sustainability, is mainly focused on the concern about sustaining the natural and cultural resources on which tourism development is based. The second is what is known as the activity- or industry-based tradition of sustainability, which aims to secure the continuity of tourism development as such. It is the last tradition which Saarinen identifies, community-based discourse, that focuses on the importance of local participation and control in tourism activities. Unlike the discourses in the two previous categories, the community-based discourse calls attention to sustainability and development as social constructions. Embracing this orientation means questioning the possibility of defining general means or goals for development in addition to the means and goals of local participation.

Tourism scholar Gayle Jennings, who has analysed how different paradigms keep informing tourism research, defines phenomenology, interpretivism, and perspectivism as some of the core approaches within the participatory paradigm.⁶⁸ Instead of tracing truths, the participatory paradigm adopts hermeneutic and transformative purposes to understand experiences and meanings. Hence, as Jennings suggests, within the paradigm the 'realities are collectively constructed via interactions between self and the other'.⁶⁹ Participatory action research has been considered one of the methodologies best suited for conducting research with – not on – the subjects of the study.⁷⁰ As tourism researchers Dianne Dredge, Rob Hales and Tazim Jamal⁷¹ suggest in their research on community case studies, the essence of this kind of research can be seen in the mutual learning, sharing and reflection

66 Telfer 2009.

67 Saarinen 2006.

68 Jennings 2009, 675.

69 Ibid.

70 Dredge et al 2013; Haanpää, Hakkarainen & Garcia-Rosell 2014.

71 Ibid.

that occur between researchers and community members. They continue, drawing on the work of another tourism scholar, Arianne Reis⁷², to point out that the potential for social transformation lies in the intersubjective communication between community members and researchers.

In practice, as the research by Dredge, Hales and Jamal⁷³ shows, the theoretical approaches and methodological choices in the case of community participation have varied greatly. While there are more reflexive studies drawing on critical theory and interpretivist approaches⁷⁴, many of them studies focus on post-positivist, retrospective assessments on what worked and what did not.⁷⁵ In fact, it seems like the studies on community participation have varied to an extent which makes it difficult to identify a shared view of the way in which the world operates⁷⁶, making it unclear whether these studies can be gathered under the umbrella of a 'participatory paradigm'.⁷⁷ Indeed, it looks like many of the academic discussions on participation, albeit with a growing number of exceptions⁷⁸, have neglected the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of participation: being, doing, dwelling and knowing together. Despite the flexible boundaries of the participatory paradigm, I see a paradox at work, especially in the positivist and post-positivist studies on participation, which claim to bracket out the researcher from the processes of constructing knowledge.⁷⁹ The paradox consists in claiming to do research where the other is being observed from a distance, without any real interaction between researchers and interlocutors: it means studying how people participate while trivializing the active agency of self and the others in research encounters.

72 Reis 2011; see also Caton 2008; 2014.

73 Dredge et al. 2013; see also Dredge & Hales 2012.

74 Ibid, 424-6; Jamal & Stronza 2008; Matarrita-Cascante 2010.

75 Butcher, Weaver & Singh 2012, 118; Zapata et al. 2011.

76 Kuhn 1962.

77 See also Jennings 2009.

78 For studies that explore different ways of knowing *together* in tourism research, see Darcy 2006, Jamal & Stronza 2008; Dredge 2011; Caton 2013, 2014; Veijola et al. 2014; Veijola & Falin 2014.

79 For more on this discussion, see Butcher et al. 2012, 118.

For instance, somewhat contrary to the idea of tourism and development as social constructions, much ink has been spilled on pragmatic studies defining how local communities fail in participating in tourism.⁸⁰ While these studies have helped us to recognize structural and operational challenges in participatory initiatives⁸¹, they seem to include an implicit assumption that local communities face difficulties participating in tourism development in the right way. As a result, community-based initiatives have been faulted for consisting of more good will and hope than actual theoretical support.⁸² The most critical voices within tourism studies, including Jim Butcher⁸³ and Louise Dixey⁸⁴, seem to condemn community participation as a failed pursuit, one which could be more or less abandoned in the scholarly debates and in practice. In response to this critique, tourism scholar Shalini Singh⁸⁵ has noted that these kinds of radical conclusions tend to arise when utopian perspectives conflict with realities. I agree with Singh when she argues that the reason for the bad reputation of participation may actually lie in the scholars' 'short-sighted' utopianism, which has reduced communitarian possibilities and challenges to goal-driven forms of community participation. This is the case especially in pro-growth development projects, that is, ones where assessment of the success and failure of participation are based on the communities' ability to reap economic benefits from the global tourism industries.⁸⁶

While the debates for and against local participation in tourism have focused on communities' possibilities of achieving material progress, I consider that quite limited attention has been drawn to the ethico-political dimensions of the issue, which supersede the straightforward intentions of promoting fair forms of tourism development. Above all, the extensive focus on the limitations, and on what does *not* happen in participatory initiatives,

80 Tosun 2000; Scheyvens 2011; Goodwin 2011.

81 Tosun 2000.

82 George, Mair & Reid 2009

83 Butcher 2012.

84 Dixey 2008.

85 Singh 2012, 113.

86 Ibid.

has eclipsed any interest in what does happen in the presentations of project-based analyses of community participation.⁸⁷ Hence, it merits mentioning that the discussion on participatory tourism development has lacked of more critical examination of its own *worlding*⁸⁸ or *worldmaking*⁸⁹ power; that is, of attention towards the ways in which different kinds of representations constitute and naturalize our world and our relations with the 'other'.⁹⁰ For instance, drawing on the analyses by Singh⁹¹ and by Dredge and Hales⁹², one can assert that the intentions to operationalize and assess participation are often aimed to eliminate those relationships between self and other which are not predictable, organized and linear. This means that many studies on participation present complexity, messiness and interdependency as major constraints on progress.⁹³ These discourses include an uncomfortable echo of Eurocentric thinking on development, in which peripheral areas, or even the entire Southern Hemisphere⁹⁴, are expected to catch up with the rational linearity of enlightened, modern-day thinking. I fully agree with Wearing and Wearing⁹⁵ that although community participation can be seen as a way to decolonize existing power relations within tourism, tourism studies have neglected the unequal power relations that exist within participatory tourism discourses.

87 On how representation is always political, see Hulme 2008; Blazer 2010.

88 Spivak (2003) refers to the continuation of imperial power relations to the present as 'worlding'. See also Kapoor 2004; McEwan 2008, 128-31.

89 On worldmaking in tourism, see Hollinshead (2002, 2007) in particular. See also Ateljevic et al. 2009; Tucker 2009; Caton 2013; 'The perspective of worldmaking in tourism'...refers to yje creative and collaborative, imaginative and materially practiced processes in tourism through which features of the world, including people, places, and practices, are essentialized, naturalized, normalized, celebrated, elided or overwritten.' (Caton 2013, 342.)

90 In their research on community case studies, Dredge & Hales (2012); Dredge et al. (2013) discuss about the possibilities of 'unleashing tourism's worldmaking capacity'.

91 Singh 2012.

92 Dredge & Hales 2012.

93 Singh (2012, 114) suggests that Murphy and Pauleen (2007) and Reid et al. (2004) are among those few who acknowledge the potential of non-linearity in participatory tourism; see also Law (2004) in Dredge & Hales (2012, 420); messy epistemologies are discussed also by Caton 2014b; and unfinished and untidy ontologies by Veijola et al. 2014.

94 Tosun 2000.

95 van der Duim et al. 2006; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

Rosemary Viswanath⁹⁶, a representative of the research and advocacy organization Equitable Tourism Options (EQUATIONS), has argued that even after many years of using tourism as a tool for development and poverty reduction, the ‘poor’ seem to remain judged for not being capable of speaking for themselves. Following the notion of social constructivism in regard to sustainable development, a growing number of tourism researchers have questioned the settings where the West and the cores have the power to name, represent and theorize the knowledge of tourism and development.⁹⁷ It has been considered problematic that tourism researchers and practitioners have on a large scale ignored tourism phenomena that fall outside of Western understandings of social and cultural construction.⁹⁸ In particular, critical tourism scholars, advocating the importance of local control and ownership in tourism development, have called for (re)discovery of neglected local knowledge in tourism in order to foster pluralism, social justice and sustainability in tourism worlds.⁹⁹ For instance, ‘hopeful tourism scholarship’, launched by Annette Pritchard, Nigel Morgan and Irena Ateljevic in the early 2010s, can be seen as an alternative paradigm within tourism, one drawing attention to ethics, reconciliation, solidarity, consciousness-raising, conservation, reciprocity and other non-market values in tourism.¹⁰⁰ It seems that the critical and ethical turns in tourism have brought the academic discussions back closer to the more radical roots of participatory theories: Antonio Gramsci’s notion of subaltern; neo-Marxism; liberation pedagogy; and postcolonial critique.¹⁰¹

Despite the return, or re-emergence, of these theoretical approaches, a review of the literature on community participation in tourism research indicates a certain thinness or narrowness within the existing participa-

96 Viswanath 2008, 46.

97 For examples, see Hollinshead 2004; Caton 2008; 2012, 1920; Pritchard et al. 2011.

98 Berno 1996 in Jennings 2009, 684; Ateljevic, Morgan & Pritchard 2007, 4.

99 The importance of taking into account local knowledge has been underlined by tourism scholars Jamal et al. 2003, 154; Higgins-Desbiolles 2006; Schilcher 2007, 184; Telfer 2009, 153; Phommavong 2011, 201; Pritchard et al. 2011, 14; Zapata et al. 2011, 23.

100 Pritchard et al. 2011: see also Higgins-Desbiolles 2006, 2008; Jamal & Everett 2007, 61; Veijola 2007; Ren et al. 2010, 887-8.

101 Caton & Santos 2009; George et al. 2009, 164-5; Ren et al, 2010; Caton 2012; Tucker 2014.

tory paradigm. On the one hand, there are normative studies on how to run, manage and evaluate participatory projects; these rarely engage in debates about the shared values behind the very idea of participation.¹⁰² As a consequence, tourism students, for instance, are often encouraged to memorize the ready-made definitions of local participation instead of critically reflecting on the political, epistemological and ontological premises that inform the topic.¹⁰³ On the other hand, there are those who embrace the idea of multiculturalism to an extent which makes it difficult to discuss why participation is actually seen as a part of good life and well-being. Are the goals to promote the goals of ‘homo oeconomicus’ to live better and larger, or to find solutions which could allow us to ‘live-well’ or, even more, to ‘live-well-between-ourselves’?¹⁰⁴ Tourism researchers such as David A. Fennell and Jose Carlos García-Rosell, as well as Tazim Jamal, working with philosopher Christopher Menzel, have explored how different kinds of ethical theories inform and shape the discussions of what is considered good, desirable or sustainable in tourism development in general.¹⁰⁵ These authors illuminate how the good actions in tourism are approached very differently when drawing on deontology, existentialism, the utilitarian ethic, Kantian ethics or Aristotelian virtue ethics. Each of these includes its own ways of understanding and valuing togetherness and the public good.

Reflecting on the contemporary neo-liberal values and Eurocentrism in tourism research, the most common approaching to ethics seems to be an individualistic cosmology in which everything begins from the self.¹⁰⁶ This means prioritizing the rights and well-being of the guest when a guest, and of the host when a host, which, in my view, limits the possibilities of understanding and promoting responsible encounters between self and the other. Instead of claiming that there is only one way that the reality of participation becomes constructed, I would submit that there are different ontologies,

102 Butcher et al. 2012, 118-19.

103 García-Rosell 2013; Veijola et al. 2014, 7; see also Caton’s (2014, 129) discussion about the processes when (tourism) students try to ‘pick’ the ‘right’ research paradigm for their research.

104 Laurinkari 2007, 17-23; Ranta 2014; see also Pattison 2013, 95-6.

105 Fennell 2006, 2008; García-Rosell 2013, 26-8; Jamal & Menzel 2009.

106 Smith M. 2009; see also Fennell 2008.

different ways of being with self and with others.¹⁰⁷ Most importantly, I feel that consciousness of different forms of consciousness belongs here and can make the discussions of tourism ethics more enjoyable.¹⁰⁸ For this reason, I argue that there exists a need to clearly articulate the visions and values of good life which support our ideas of community and participation. In the context of community-based tourism this would mean explaining what we mean by the notion of participation and expressing why participation might be considered ethical in the first place.

In sum, the participatory paradigm in tourism and development studies simultaneously celebrates and criticizes the liberal, autonomous subject. In the first place, the principle of participation emphasizes everyone's right to benefit from tourists' interest in their home community and also to decide what is good for them. At the same time, the community participation narrative is perceived as an ethical alternative to individualistic society, driven by the market ideology, where everyone is responsible mainly for themselves. Interestingly, sociologist Albert O. Hirschman¹⁰⁹ has claimed that society tires of the individualistic mind-set in 10-15-year cycles. This would mean that also the search for solidarity and participation tends to weaken and we gladly return to mind our own business as usual. It seems that Hirschman's estimate of a 10-15-year cycle between faith and disappointment in individual action has been, with a few years' margin, embodied in the tourism literature. For instance, two decades after Murphy published his book, which gave him the legacy of the 'founding father' of the participatory discourse in tourism, he co-authored another one about the need for stronger control and strategic management focus when involving communities in tourism development.¹¹⁰ There are also other tourism researchers who seem to have gradually lost their faith in the principle of community participation in tourism settings.¹¹¹

107 Veijola et al. 2014.

108 Levinas in *Totality and Infinity* (1969, 112) writes that '[W]e live in the consciousness of consciousness, but this consciousness is not reflection. It is not knowing but enjoyment, and, as we shall say, the very egoism of life.'

109 Hautamäki et al. 2005, 7.

110 Murphy 1985; Murphy & Murphy 2004.

111 See, for instance, Scheyvens 1999 and 2011.

Then again, some philosophers, such as Giorgio Agamben¹¹², suggest that the search for a community and communality is a pertinent part of being human and hence infinitely present in a 'state of becoming'. Similarly, Singh¹¹³ argues that community participation and communitarian reciprocity are human processes which are always emergent. The present research joins the stream of tourism studies which approach participation as a fundamental part of relating to others. It argues that the illusion of participation as a new approach to tourism and development has taken the focus away from discussions of the social in participatory encounters. I agree with Singh, who takes issue with the existing scepticism and hopelessness in many community participation case-studies. She asks whether it might be possible or meaningful to abandon participation per se as an approach, given that interaction, action and engagement are intrinsic to humankind.¹¹⁴ Instead, in Singh's view, the failures of the past should encourage us to redouble the efforts to look for fresh perspectives to establish participation as a part of our humanity.¹¹⁵

By telling about my research journey I wish to join the academic discussions begun and sustained by Singh, Tucker, Jamal, Stronza, Camargo, Dredge and Hales, among others, who have encouraged us to explore the different potentialities of local participation – of doing and being together in tourism settings.¹¹⁶ The research discussed in this volume focuses on exploring 'hospitality' and 'welcome' as terms for describing, disrupting and shaping social imaginings and arrangements between ourselves.¹¹⁷ Thus, rather than trivializing the principle of participation, this study describes it as the basis of ethical relations. I will now proceed towards unfolding my approach.

112 Agamben 2009.

113 Singh 2012, 114.

114 Ibid. 113

115 Butcher et al. 2012, 118.

116 Jamal & Stronza 2008; Singh 2012; Dredge et al. 2013; Jamal & Camargo 2014; Jamal & Dredge 2014; Tucker 2014, 206; see also Veijola et al. 2014.

117 Fruitfulness of these conceptualizations explored by the editors of *Hospitality and Society*, Lynch et al. 2011.

1.3 Hospitality as a means and goal of the study

Hospitality is a phenomenon as old as human history.¹¹⁸ However, over the last couple of decades hospitality has enjoyed a renaissance with the growing international mobility of tourists, travelers, migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, on one hand, and with the powerful philosophical writings which explore the experiences of colonialism and postcolonial xenophobia, on the other.¹¹⁹ While my study is firmly moored in tourism research, it crosses thresholds and draws inspiration in particular from postcolonial philosophies of hospitality.¹²⁰

The scientific purpose of the study is to deconstruct¹²¹ and envision alternatives to *participatory encounters* through the notion of *hospitality*. Hence, my study explores how the notion of hospitality might offer an alternative approach to reflect on the ways we *participate*, that is, how we relate to others and to ourselves.¹²² By doing this, I locate participation in the intersection of intersubjectivity, ethics and hospitality. The approach adopted builds on the discussions of French philosophers Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Derrida on renewing subjectivity and ethics through the notions of hospitality and welcome.¹²³ The discussions became public after Levinas' death in 1995, in Derrida's *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*.¹²⁴ The book consists of two parts: of Derrida's moving funeral oration called 'Adieu' and of essay titled 'The Word of Welcome' based on a lecture Derrida gave in a homage to Levinas

118 O'Gorman 2010, 3-6.

119 Still 2010, 1; see also Rosello 2001; Germann-Molz & Gibson 2007; Kuokkanen 2007; Lynch et al. 2011; Baker 2011, 2013.

120 Ibid, 7.

121 I follow here Critchely's (1999) approach to 'The Ethics of Deconstruction which builds on Derrida's and Levinas' thinking. Critchley (1999, 1) argues that 'the textual practice of deconstructive reading can and, moreover, *should* be understood as an ethical demand'. I also agree with Kuokkanen (2007, xiv) who writes 'Deconstruction has proven helpful in its insistence that we pay attention to the exclusions and silences in narratives. It also impels us to recognize how we all participate in what we criticize.'

122 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Baker 2013, 4; Veijola et al. 2014.

123 Levinas T&I 1969, 27; Derrida AEL 1999; see also Raffoul's (1998) translation and interpretation of Derrida's original version from French to English.

124 Derrida AEL 1999.

on the first anniversary of his death at the Richelieu Amphitheatre at the Sorbonne in Paris.¹²⁵

For Derrida, the first of Levinas' best-known and extant works, *Totality and Infinity* (1961), should be approached as 'an immense treatise of hospitality'.¹²⁶ In this work Levinas¹²⁷ suggests that the Western intellectual tendency to *totalize* definitions of subjectivity and ontology should be resisted by the ethical recognition of openness, receptivity and *infinity*. The impetus for this stance can be found in Levinas' disappointment with the oppressive dichotomies between self and other, subject and object, which tend to prioritize the freedom of being over the relation with the other. Levinas developed his ethical thought in a post-war climate, directing his concern towards the egocentric idea of being that did not do justice to our original experience of the other person¹²⁸, that is, to *the phenomenology of the other*.¹²⁹ He builds his critique especially on the necessity to move *beyond* Martin Heidegger's ontology of *Being (Dasein)* in order to address our responsibility for the other.¹³⁰ For Levinas, ethics are not situated in self, but in the intersubjective relation with the other person, in being-for-the-other.¹³¹ He argues that the obligation to do justice to the other and to *welcome* the other 'calls in question the naïve right of my powers, my glorious spontaneity as a living being'.¹³²

It is the Levinasian idea of the other prior to self that has changed and keeps changing contemporary European philosophy.¹³³ What makes his

125 *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* is Derrida's third major engagement with Levinas philosophy after 'Violence and Metaphysics' in *Writing and Difference* (1967/1978) and *At this very moment in this work here I am* (1980). See also Raffoul 2002, 211.

126 Ibid. 21. *Totality and Infinity* published in 1961, translated from French to English in 1969.

127 Levinas T&I 1969; see also Hand 2009, 24, 36; Ladyga 2012, 226.

128 Wild 1969, 12.

129 Ibid. 12-13.

130 For Levinas' argument about the necessity of moving beyond Heidegger's (1927/1972) idea of Being, see e.g. T&I 1969, 89, 179; see also Levinas' *Otherwise than Being, or Beyond Essence* (1974) where he continues to develop his thinking on ethical metaphysics.

131 Raffoul 1998; 2010; 2014; Drabinski & Nelson 2014. While Levinas was one of the first philosophers to build on Heidegger's influential thought in *Being and Time* (1927/1972), he has also been faulted for misinterpreting and limited reading of Heidegger's work.

132 Levinas T&I 1969, 85; see also Hiddleston 2009, 19-20.

133 Derrida AEL 1999, 8-12; Drabinski 2011, xii.

thought unique in the Western spirit of morality and justice, is the idea of relational mode of being which escapes from the isolated subject by desiring and respecting the alterity of the other.¹³⁴ That is, as ethical subjectivity is constituted in this relationship with alterity, Levinasian ethics *begins* from the Other, who is never a mere object.¹³⁵ In Levinas' work the relationship with the other is not based on a particular ontology, but on original responsibility for the other, which is essential in us from the beginning. In this sense, ethics for Levinas is not just one area of philosophy, but first philosophy, in which human existence is always situated in the unavoidable light of infinity.¹³⁶ His approach to ethics, which draws from Jewish thought as an intellectual tradition, is embodied in his presentation of the *face* of the other.¹³⁷ For Levinas, the face is not a physical detail, but refers to the *infinite alterity* of the other, who is free from any idea which one can produce of the other.¹³⁸ It is then the face in face-to-face encounters that issues us with an absolute ethical challenge¹³⁹: it challenges us to engage in acts of welcoming and responsibility without systematizing or mastering the other.

In *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, Derrida suggests that Levinas' philosophy as a whole should be approached from the perspective of an unlimited responsibility and hospitality that precede and exceed one's freedom.¹⁴⁰ As Levinas' ideas have been formed against any conception of subjectivity as totalized and dominant over the other, his thinking has been pertinent to postcolonial philosophy.¹⁴¹ Most of all, his other-oriented mode of speaking and thinking moves the focus from conceptual constructions towards greater readiness to listen and learn from experience.¹⁴² Reading Levinas,

134 Laachir, 2007, 180-1; For the significance of Levinas' thought, see Blancot 1969, 50-52 quoted in Derrida AEL 1999, 9; Peperzak ed. (1995) *Ethics as First Philosophy: The Significance of Emmanuel Levinas for Philosophy, Literature and Religion*

135 See for instance Levinas T&I 1969, 299-307; see also Wild 1969, 13; Ahmed 2000, 141; Drabinski 2013, 51, 94.

136 Levinas T&I 1969, 304; Derrida AEL 1999, 4, 48; see also Peperzak 1995; Hand 2009, 36-7.

137 Levinas T&I 1969, 79-81; Kallio-Tavin 2013, 26.

138 Laachir 2007, 180; Hand 2009, 36.

139 Ibid.

140 Derrida AEL 1999, 3.

141 Hiddleston 2009, 6, 16; Drabinski 2013, 22; Dussel 2013.

142 Wild 1969, 16.

and Derrida's engagement with Levinas thought, has encouraged me to look for the irreducibility and 'other-orientedness' in *participation*. By taking 'being-for-the-other' as an ontological starting point, I wish to redirect the focus to the assumption that, in the context of hospitality and participation, the self and the other are expected to *care* for each other's well-being.¹⁴³

A valid entry point into theoretical discussions of hospitality, as Derrida explains it, is the necessary but impossible conjunction of *laos* and *politics*, of hospitality on the one hand, and the *ethics* of hospitality (an ethics *as* hospitality) on the other.¹⁴⁴ While the former is based on conditions and obligations, the latter invites us to think about the possibility of absolutely unconditional, open and infinite welcoming. For Derrida, hospitality which relies on conditions and obligations between people *delimits* rather than *opens up* borders and spaces for new possibilities. While saying this, he directs his critique especially towards Immanuel Kant's thought of hospitality based on juridical and political rights of visitation.¹⁴⁵ Hence, for Derrida the Levinasian idea of ethics as infinite openness to alterity should be seen as an inspiration and aspiration to fall short of.¹⁴⁶ Instead of presenting *laos* or *politics of hospitality* and *ethics of hospitality* as opposite to each other, Derrida argues that it is *between* these two conceptions of hospitality that responsibilities and conditions of welcoming become negotiated.¹⁴⁷ Drawing on the writings of Levinas and Derrida, the present research considers that it is in these spheres and spaces – in these encounters – where responsibility for the other could become possible. For instance, scholars in the political

143 See also Smith & Duffy 2003, 109, 113; Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Kuokkanen 2007, 130; Smith M. 2009; Jokinen & Veijola 2012; Jamal & Camargo 2014; Veijola et al. 2014.

144 Derrida AEL 1999, 19-20; 2000, 75, 77; 2005, 6-9, 19) In *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* Derrida (1999, 19-20) writes about the relationship between an *ethics of hospitality* and *politics and a law* (indefinite, singular) of hospitality. However, in his later work (2000, 75), Derrida uses the notion of *the law of hospitality* (definite, singular) in order to describe unconditional, Levinasian *ethics of hospitality*. Hence, I have chosen to use the singular form – *the law of hospitality* – when I refer to the ethics of hospitality where the other is received beyond the capacity of the self, and the plural form – the laws of hospitality – when I refer to the politics and regulations of hospitality. See also Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 4-5; Still 2010, 8; Baker 2010, 89-93; 2013, 1.

145 Derrida AEL 1999, 49-50.

146 Ibid; 2000; 2002, 349-59: see also Baker 2013, 3.

147 Derrida AEL 19-21; 2000, 80-1, 135-7.

sciences, such as Rauna Kuokkanen, Sarah Gibson, Mireille Rosello, Judith Still and Gideon Baker, have previously analysed ethics and responsibility using a somewhat similar approach.¹⁴⁸

In line with Levinas' notions of *totality* and *infinity*, and Derrida's concept of *hospitality*, the study argues that participation cannot be based on totalizing conditions and rules that are meant to master or control the other. Instead, as in the case of hospitality, the conditions of participation become constantly negotiated in intersubjective relations between self and the other. In adopting this approach, the study joins the efforts of what Jennie Germann Molz and Gibson describe as 'mobilizing hospitality'.¹⁴⁹ These authors have called for dialogue and mobility between different discussions of hospitality in order to explore how the deployment of the concept in one disciplinary context may provide insights in other fields. In particular, the theme of ethics in mobile relations is one of the strongest threads that ties together different discussions on hospitality. Most importantly, as Friese¹⁵⁰ argues, in these studies the question is not only 'thinking *of* hospitality, but thinking *as* hospitality'. Germann Molz¹⁵¹ highlights the relationality of hospitality by calling it an act of sharing spatial, material and emotional resources. She encourages us to consider the ethics of welcoming a stranger, the possibilities of doing togetherness at home and on the move and asking what hospitality encounters can teach us about living in difference.

Importantly, the call for mobilizing hospitality does not imply only mobilizing the conceptualization as such. Instead, unlike studies on tourism and hospitality management, cultural studies of tourism draw attention to mobilization of dualistic subject positions between hosts and guests, self and other, female and male, individual and community.¹⁵² These positions have been discussed extensively in the research by the Finnish sociologists, tourism scholars and feminist theorists Soile Veijola and Eeva Jokinen.¹⁵³

148 For a comprehensive analysis of Levinas' idea of responsibility, see Raffoul 2010, 2014.

149 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007.

150 Friese 2004, 74 in Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 2.

151 Germann Molz 2012, Keynote, Birmingham.

152 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Veijola 2010; Veijola et al. 2014; Veijola & Falin 2014.

153 Veijola & Jokinen 1994; 2008; 2012.

They argue that in the global economic systems it is no longer easy to tell the guests from the hosts, private from public or work from home.¹⁵⁴ Through their discussions on contemporary arrangements of gender and hospitality, they have introduced the notion of post-host-guest society which suggests that tourists and their host(esse)s become simultaneously subjects and objects of care.¹⁵⁵ Interestingly, the Levinasian notions of host and guest, both *hôte* in French, seem to describe settings where the pre-set roles between self and other cease to exist.¹⁵⁶

In cultural studies of tourism, much attention has also been paid to the ways in which tourism practices might be based on the re-production of 'otherness', a focus that has made the concepts of 'tourist's gaze', 'authenticity' and 'alterity' central.¹⁵⁷ What is common to these discussions in tourism research, to postcolonial criticism and to Levinasian thought is the central role of 'the o/Other'. The present embraces the different ways the concept has been used to describe and define self's relation with the other. While in postcolonial thought 'the Other' is generally understood as the one who becomes silenced, in Levinasian writings 'the Other' (*autrui*), when capitalized, carries a positive connotation of 'the personal other', which evokes the idea of philosophical and ontologically given alterity.¹⁵⁸ To put it differently, in postcolonial critique the Other's alterity becomes defined in comparison to self; for Levinas¹⁵⁹, the Other's difference and infinity is not reduced to totality.

Although Levinas' suggestion of ethics as *responsibility-for-the-other* and *being-for-the-other* echoes in the arguments for participation and inclusion, his idea of a responsible subject is very different from the modern idea of self as a free and responsible individual; this can be seen in the way he challenges us to confront the very question of social life itself.¹⁶⁰ Hence,

154 Ibid, 2012.

155 Ibid. 2012, 40; 2008; see also Veijola 2010.

156 Derrida AEL 1999, 41-3; for the conceptualization of 'continuum' between hosting and guesting, see Rosello (2001, 18, 118).

157 Smith, M. K. 2003, 13; MacCannell 1976/1990; Urry 1990; Jamal & Hill 2002.

158 See also Cohen 1987, viii; Kallio-Tavin 2013, 25; Drabinski 2013.

159 Levinas T&I 1969, 180-1.

160 Crossley 1996, 174; Oksala 2001, 67; Smith M. 2009; Höckert 2014.

it seems meaningful to make more space for his reflections in the ethical landscapes of tourism.¹⁶¹ Tourism scholar Mick Smith¹⁶² has also underlined the importance of including Levinasian ethics in the contemporary discussions in tourism and hospitality studies. Although Smith has not engaged in the theoretical discussions on hospitality, his critique of contemporary discussions on ethics in tourism is very much in line with the critique which Derrida directs towards Kantian thought on external laws of ethics. In other words, in my view, Derrida's division of two laws of hospitality resonates well with Smith's¹⁶³ analysis of contemporary discussions of ethical tourism, in which he views ethics mainly as rules, like the law of hospitality, instead of as the basis for being.

In his analysis Smith¹⁶⁴ shows how even more sophisticated discussions of ethics become stuck reconstructing a struggle between, on the one hand, external impositions of social solidarity and, on the other, biologically generated self-centred and egoistic desires. This means that any expression of concern for others is implicitly or explicitly associated with the cultural repression of necessary satisfaction or more primal, instinctual and natural needs. This approach to ethics (also to be seen in development discussions) is built on the idea of how responsibility towards the other, helping the other and so forth might actually be something unnatural, something imposed on us from the outside. Therefore, calling for ethical practices in tourism and development would for the most part be a matter of moralizing and guilt-tripping people into fulfilling their social obligations. Doing so would mean expecting people to engage in something that might be very much against their 'naturally' self-interested inclinations.¹⁶⁵

The idea of modern subjectivity is often presented as a tradition of autonomous and self-interested individuals who are using their rational abili-

161 For previous explorations of Levinas' philosophy in Tourism Studies, see Duffy & Smith 2003; Fennell 2008; Ankor 2009; Smith M, 2009a; 2009b, 614; Ankor & Wearing 2012; Grimwood & Doubleway 2013.

162 Smith, M. 2009a.

163 Ibid.

164 Ibid. 263.

165 Ibid. 264.

ties to promote their own interests.¹⁶⁶ It is the assumption that ‘we are all individuals’ which is seen to underlie liberal and neoclassical understandings of economics and politics.¹⁶⁷ In tourism settings, as discussed previously in the work of Veijola¹⁶⁸ and also Veijola and Falin¹⁶⁹, the notion of subject is connected primarily to an active, individual tourist. Or, as Kellee Caton¹⁷⁰ puts it, in tourism ‘the figure of the Self looms large’. Smith¹⁷¹ also laments how ‘this model of human existence is so self-centred that it initially seems difficult to reconcile with any kinds of ethics at all’. I agree with Smith that these conceptions of ethics have regrettably restricted the imaginings and openness of academic debates. It is this tradition of autonomous subject that Levinas’ notion of hospitality, openness to the other, seeks to interrupt. This does not mean aiming to ‘kill the subject’, in post-modern style¹⁷², but to redefine subjectivity as the ‘subject of the welcome’.¹⁷³

Although the Levinasian vision of infinitely open welcoming between ourselves can be seen as a mere utopia, Derrida¹⁷⁴ proposes it as a way to interrupt and move beyond the individualist tradition of self. Levinasian thinking, as I understand it, resonates well with so-called *indigenous cosmologies*, in which subjectivity is based on relational ontologies. Indigenous cosmologies have attracted special attention particularly in a long tradition of anthropological studies which have sought to denaturalize modern ontological assumptions.¹⁷⁵ One such study is Marion Blazer’s longitudinal learning journey with the Yashiro people of the Paraguayan Chako, which tells a story of the less-acknowledged potentials of relational worlds.¹⁷⁶ Recently a growing number of scholars have studied the Andean vision of *vivir bien* (good life, *suma qamaña*), which is seen to embrace an alternative

166 Fennell 2006; 2008, 3.

167 Smith 2009b, 620; see also Fennell 2009, 2012.

168 Veijola 1997; 2010; see also Valtonen & Veijola 2011.

169 Veijola & Falin 2014.

170 Caton 2014a, 185.

171 Smith 2009, 264.

172 See Ronkainen 1999.

173 Derrida AEL 1999.

174 Ibid. 51-2; for Levinas’ idea of interrupting self, see T&I, 39, 82-4.

175 Blazer 2010, 235.

176 Ibid., I want to thank Jeremy Gould for recommending this wonderful book.

way of understanding reciprocity and the other; that is, it is an alternative way to the Western, growth-oriented, development thinking that separates people from each other and from nature. For instance, in her ethnographic research on indigeneity and state formation in Bolivia, development scholar Eija Ranta describes the crux of the process as being the political activation of indigenous cosmologies in which all beings exist in relation to others and never in the form of an individual or an object.¹⁷⁷ In my view, the paradigm of *vivir bien*, which means ‘living well between ourselves’ – instead of ‘living better’ – coincides with Levinas’ notions of subject formation, in which ‘subjectivity is not for itself, it is initially for another’.¹⁷⁸

However, Levinas’ radical idea of ethics as first philosophy has been treated primarily as a Western alternative to the Western essential ontology of being.¹⁷⁹ Hence, the most obvious place to look for Levinas is the discourse on the ethical turn in continental philosophy.¹⁸⁰ These discussions are normally traced to Husserl’s phenomenology, and then followed through Martin Heidegger, Hannah Arendt and Levinas all the way to Luce Irigaray and Derrida. Phenomenological philosophy does not emphasise participation as such, but the discussions cited include an interest in the origin of ethics and values and encourage considering the issues of responsibility and response. As the ethics sought are thought to be found in the encounters between subjects, the central themes of this tradition touch the questions of love, wonder, responsibility, generosity, gift and *hospitality*.¹⁸¹ For Levinas¹⁸², infinite responsibility is also manifest in the never-enough character of giving, gesture and charity.

While drawing on Levinasian thinking on intersubjectivity, this study builds on the discussions of relational ontologies that embrace and call for

177 Kuokkanen 2007, 59–62; Escobar 2010; Ranta-Owusu 2010; Ranta 2014.

178 See also Höckert 2014; In the third chapter of this book I will focus in some detail on Rauna Kuokkanen’s (2007) research on indigenous knowledges in academia, a line of inquiry in which she draws on Levinas’ writings on subjectivity and hospitality.

179 Hand 2009; Drabinski 2013; Maldonado-Torres 2010, 94–6.

180 Heinämaa & Oksala 2001, 11–4.

181 Ibid.; Veijola et al 2014.

182 Levinas T&I 1969, 304–6; Drabinski 2013, 18.

messiness, openness and unfinishedness in social relations¹⁸³, analysed by Veijola, Germann-Molz, Pyyhtinen, Grit and myself in *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy guests, Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities*.¹⁸⁴ The book explores tourism and host-guest relations through deliberately untidy concepts such as *camping, parasite, silence, unlearning* and *serendipities*. By arguing, along with Jean-Luc Nancy and Georg Simmel, that existence is always co-existence, we contrast 'alternative ontologies of tourism to the ones that take reality to exist through clear-cut and self-subsistent beings, subjects and categories'. To imagine alternative ontologies, we 'introduce the concept of "the untidy guest" to argue that when scholars – and indeed tourism itself – confound and interrupt habitual interactions and assumptions, this may lead to new ideas and understandings of the "good life"'.¹⁸⁵ In the study at hand I elaborate on the importance of stronger acknowledgement of this relational ontology within the participatory paradigm in tourism.¹⁸⁶ This implies moving from *doing together* towards *doing togetherness*.

In the following sections, I offer a short presentation of the methodology and data used in this research, as well as an outline of the rest of the study.

1.4 Methodology and data

If subjectivities are formed through encounters with the other¹⁸⁷, the principle of hospitality should also be applied to the epistemological and methodological discussions of the study.¹⁸⁸ I take seriously tourism researcher Keith Hollinshead's¹⁸⁹ argument that 'the matters of ontology should always

183 Hollinshead 1998; German-Molz & Gibson 2007; Keen & Tucker, 2012; Dredge et al. 2013; Grit & Lynch 2013; Tucker 2014.

184 Veijola et al. 2014.

185 Ibid. 4; For discussions on 'good life' in context of Tourism Studies, see Jamal 2004; Jamal & Menzel 2009; Tribe 2009; Caton 2012, 196-197; 2014.

186 This thematic has been recently brought up by Tucker 2014.

187 See e.g. Levinas T&I 1969, 304-6; see also Ronkainen 1999, 14, 49; Vrasti 2013, 88.

188 See also Germann-Molz & Gibson 2007; Hiddleston 2009, 184; Nykänen & Veijola 2013, 92-3.

189 Hollinshead 2004, 84; for more on the relation between ontology and epistemology in Tourism Studies, see Ayikoru 2009; Jennings 2009.

precede the choice of particular research method'.¹⁹⁰ While moving from Levinasian reflections towards methodological discussions means exceeding the scope of Levinas' own texts, I think that the phenomenological method in particular is pivotal for imagining what Levinas' thinking on hospitality and welcome could look like. At this point, I should make it clear that this study is not an anthropological study that aims to describe what Nicaraguan hospitality or cosmologies might be like. Neither is it my purpose to offer recommendations whether or not tourism should be promoted and developed in rural communities. Instead, the study proposes that focusing on the micro-encounters between tourism experts and local communities can make it possible to understand different ways of perceiving ethical relations between ourselves.¹⁹¹

I collected the data for the analysis through longitudinal ethnographic research on rural tourism development in Nicaragua between the years 2007 and 2013. During this time I conducted a total of three field visits; the first in 2007-2008 as part of my master's thesis, the second as a doctoral student during a four-month period in 2011-2012, and the last in May 2013. Although my research interest and questions have changed throughout the process, I have continued to collect qualitative data through semi-structured interviews and participatory observation. During the study I abandoned my preliminary plans of conducting participatory action research, since I noticed that the local communities had become weary of outside-led development projects. Hence, my own study is in line with Caton's¹⁹² suggestion that epistemological and methodological choices are often made on the basis of the researcher's feeling of doing right by the research participants. The empirical data that I collected consist of fifty-five semi-structured interviews: thirty-eight were conducted in the tourism communities in San Ramón, while the rest were what I have described above as expert interviews. I

190 While saying this, I also agree with Caton (2014) that a researcher's ontological and epistemological understandings are very much shaped in her/his encounters with research participants in the particular context.

191 By doing this, I wish to contribute to the recent volume of *Moral Encounters*, edited by Mostafanezhad & Hannam 2014.

192 Caton 2014b, 127.

have listed the dates and the number of each interview in Appendix 2. In addition to the interviews, the analysed data includes field notes from participatory observation, newspaper articles, as well as tourism policy and strategy documents produced by different institutions promoting rural tourism development in Nicaragua.

During my first fieldwork period I collected data primarily among rural communities in San Ramón through group and individual interviews and by observing encounters between tourism experts and local hosts. At that time my principal interest lay in the social and cultural impacts of rural tourism development.¹⁹³ Before my second visit to Nicaragua, in 2012, I had broadened my focus to rural tourism development in the country in general. Following up this interest, I conducted interviews in the Nicaraguan tourism ministry, international aid organizations and NGOs, and had close contact with two universities in Managua. At the same time, I was interested in continuing to follow how the people in the communities of San Ramón experienced the heightened national and international interest in rural tourism development. The second field visit was guided especially by my interest in the role of ‘local knowledges’ in community-based tourism development. However, engaging at the time with postcolonial critique encouraged me to question not only the preconceptions that guide supposedly participatory tourism encounters, but also the images and assumptions which keep shaping academic research.¹⁹⁴ Hence, by the last field work period in Nicaragua in 2013, the focus of my study had moved from questions of knowledge towards questions of relations and mutual receptivity in rural tourism encounters.

I agree with tourism scholars who see the participatory paradigm as an approach countering the previous hegemony of post-positivist studies, which separate the researcher from the data and phenomenon under study.¹⁹⁵ For me this means that my research journey is also infused with reflections about my own learning experiences during the walks and talks on the highlands of Nicaragua, and in the air-conditioned offices in Managua. Crucially, my

193 Höckert 2009.

194 Caton 2013.

195 Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Jamal & Everett 2007; Jennings 2009; Dredge & Hales 2012; see also Veijola & Jokinen 1994.

hundreds of pages of field notes have helped me to return to my reflections on my own prejudices, confusions and processes of learning and unlearning throughout the journey.¹⁹⁶ Yet, the purpose of this self-reflectivity is not to turn the present work into a study about me, but rather to make visible the different leaps I have made between the empirical, methodological and theoretical poles of the study.¹⁹⁷

Valuing highly the Levinasian idea of relationality and Spivak's call for acknowledging one's privileges and positionality in one's relation with the 'other', my study has steadily moved from more conventional forms of ethnography towards the discussions of dialogic critical ethnography or post-critical ethnography.¹⁹⁸ According to Jordan and Yeomans, Hytten and Madison, the main themes of these ethnographic approaches include, first, locating ethics in the centre of methodological considerations; second, demanding consciousness of and accountability for one's own assumptions and biases; and, third, promoting openness and avoiding closed ends. These can be seen as attempts to interrupt the persistent legacy of colonialism, one that even many emancipatory research methodologies unwittingly sustain. I understand the approaches cited as a call for reflexivity about the ways in which the informants welcome me as a researcher and as a guest. What is more, they urge me to question my own openness towards my informants and the data I have collected, transcribed and analysed in the course of the present research.

In my analysis of the data, I draw inspiration from Martin Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology, which has later been developed and operationalized by Hans-Georg Gadamer¹⁹⁹ and Max van Manen²⁰⁰. Hermeneutic phenomenology can be described as a study of lived experience which offers an opportunity to explore how meaningful experiences come about.²⁰¹ It

196 Gadamer 1975 in Langdridge 2007, 123; Caton 2013, 347.

197 Rantala 2011a/b.

198 Jordan & Yeomans 1995; Hytten 2004; Madison 2012.

199 Gadamer 1975.

200 van Manen 1990; see also Ronkainen 1999, 81-2; Judén Tupakka 2007; Langdridge 2007; Pernecky & Jamal 2010.

201 Ibid, 1056; 1063; for examples of hermeneutic phenomenology in tourism studies, see: Edelman 2007; Caton 2013.

entails addressing the intersubjective character of experiences by focusing on meanings and understandings and interpretations.²⁰² A decisive reason for my choosing this approach is the way in which the idea of the ‘hermeneutic circle’, developed by the thinkers cited, includes the Levinasian conception of the infinity and unfinishedness of a responsible relation. However, unlike Levinas, the above-mentioned phenomenologists acknowledge the historicity of experience, meaning that there are always pre-understandings which shape lived experiences – and the expressions of them.²⁰³ In this study I refer to these biases, pre-conceptions, prejudices and presuppositions also as ‘imaginings’.²⁰⁴

Tourism scholars such as Johan Edelheim²⁰⁵, Tomas Pernecky and Jamal²⁰⁶ have pointed out that hermeneutic phenomenology is a valuable but underutilized approach for understanding different kinds of experiences in tourism settings. Where the approach has been used, it has primarily been to understand the experiences of tourists. By contrast, my study focuses on local communities’ and tourism experts’ experiences of tourism development. More specifically, the phenomena under scrutiny are the encounters that take place in rural tourism development. My analysis of the data consists in asking how, on the one hand, people living in rural communities – hosts – and, on the other, tourism experts – guests – experience, interpret and give meanings to the meetings that take place between themselves or, put more aptly, between ourselves.

I began the analysis, following van Manen’s²⁰⁷ suggestion, by searching for expressions of experiences using the methods of holistic and selective reading, and then continued then in the fashion of a hermeneutic circle. In essence, this approach encourages one to become open to and surprised by different experiences, understandings and meanings that people give to the

202 Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1056.

203 Ibid. 1058

204 For more detailed exploration of Gadamer’s thought, see Caton 2013.

205 Edelheim 2007, 2015.

206 Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1057.

207 van Manen 1990.

phenomena under scrutiny.²⁰⁸ Accordingly, throughout the analysis I draw attention to how different actors – people living in the communities of San Ramón, tourism developers, students, researchers, teachers and, in some way, also the travellers – describe their relations with others. This includes constant reflection about my own pre-assumptions about these encounters. It is these relational and self-critical attitudes that, according to Tazim Jamal and Keith Hollinshead²⁰⁹, make interpretivist phenomenological studies more reliable than those which hide prejudices and biases behind the value of objectivity.

Sociologist Howard S. Becker²¹⁰ has argued against what he sees as a misleading requirement that academic studies should somehow be able ‘to nail it’. In fact, I suggest that the purpose of ‘nailing it’ is contradictory to the aims of phenomenology and the hermeneutic circle to avoid dead ends. Hospitality – as the ontological, epistemological and methodological basis of the present research – supports the idea of keeping the door open to unpredictable and unexpected.²¹¹ This is what Johan Edelheim calls phenomenology: it is like testing to see if one can walk without a banister to guide the way.²¹² He considers this important in order to explore new paths that do not cling to ‘banisters’ erected by earlier texts within Tourism Studies. I acknowledge the challenges in this, especially as my preconceptions, or imaginings, are undoubtedly shaped by my previous encounters, not least my continuous engagement with the academic discussions in tourism and development studies. In this light, it is not possible to approach and critique these fields of studies from the position of a passer-by or an outsider.

Thus, similarly to previous ethnographic research conducted by Jamal and Stronza²¹³ in the Peruvian Amazon, Vrasti²¹⁴ in Guatemala and Gambia, and

208 Edelheim 2007.

209 Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; see also Edelheim 2007, 89; Caton 2013.

210 Becker, 1998.

211 See Derrida’s discussion on welcoming unexpected in AEL, 1999, 21–6.

212 Edelheim 2007, 66. In connection to this metaphor, Edelheim refers to Muecke (1999) and to the way in which he ‘utilises one of Arendt’s mental construct, which has a basis in her phenomenological writing’, when he refers to Arendt’s metaphor of ‘thinking without a banister’.

213 Jamal & Stronza 2008.

214 Vrasti 2013.

others, my study uses the case of San Ramón as a way to gain understanding about the contradictions in emancipatory intentions to help the 'other'. My having to describe the phenomenon through the process of writing and re-writing inevitably raises the question of representation. Tourism scholars, such as Dianne Dredge, Rob Hales and Tazim Jamal,²¹⁵ and also Hazel Tucker²¹⁶, have underlined the importance of using community case studies for challenging – instead of strengthening – hidden and unquestioned assumptions and representations of the other. Spivak, too, reminds us that our interactions with, and representations of, 'the subaltern other in the Third World are inevitably loaded by our positioning as researchers, experts or activists'.²¹⁷ This means consideration that tourism developers, along with tourism and hospitality researchers, need to re-examine the continued replication and dominance of Western-centric perspectives in theoretical, epistemological and methodological aspects of travel and tourism.²¹⁸ Spivak's argument thus calls for continual questioning and reflexivity about one's one position when attempting to help and represent the other and multiple others.

1.5 Structure of the study

Ethical epistemologies, a notion introduced by Veijola²¹⁹, call for responsible relationships between researchers. In this sense, producing knowledge can be seen as an act of opening spaces and welcoming self and other to think differently.²²⁰ In my study, hospitality offers not only the theoretical and methodological frameworks, but also shapes the styles and structure of the book. The division of the work into chapters follows Veijola's²²¹ approach

215 Dredge et al. 2013; Hales and Jamal 2013.

216 Tucker 2010, 2014.

217 McEwan's (2009, 275) quotation of Spivak's thought. See also Sharpe & Spivak 2002, 620.

218 Jennings 2009, 685; see also Hollinshead, 2007; Caton 2013; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

219 Veijola has introduced the concept of 'Ethical epistemologies of tourism'.

220 Heinämaa 1996, 171; Veijola 1997, 35.

221 Veijola 1997, 43; 2003.

on hospitable writing, which – here – means welcoming the reader to visit the chapters chronologically or in any order she or he chooses.

Following the introduction, the second chapter takes a closer look at the previous research on *community participation*, not only in *tourism research*, but also in *development studies*. Bringing together these two fields of study is necessary in order to understand and anchor the discussions of community participation in relation to different development theories in general. Starting with the history of the participatory paradigm in development studies, the chapter traces different ideological, theoretical and practical grounds that have been shaping the debates on community participation since the 1960s. By doing this, the first section of the chapter demonstrates how the ideas of local participation have evolved from the discourses of imperialism towards discourses of small-scale, locally owned, inclusive development, especially in economically marginalized areas. Moving on to the development of the participatory paradigm in tourism research, I describe how the conceptualizations of *community*, *participation*, and *empowerment* have been approached, and later also criticized, in case studies on community-based tourism. However, while the critique in development studies has targeted paternalism and Eurocentrism in participatory discourses, tourism researchers have focused extensively on debating the benefits and limitations of community participation in tourism development. The chapter points out that the discussions on responsible and ethical forms of tourism have overlooked the rich and even contradictory roots of the idea of participation. Enriching and stirring these discussions in tourism require a readiness to re-examine how we relate to others.

Chapter 3 elaborates the theoretical framework of the study: the notions of hospitality and welcome as the foundation of ethical relations. My argument is that contemporary search for ethical encounters within tourism have primarily been driven by self-oriented, ethno- and Eurocentric ideas of hospitality, participation and responsibility. The call for hospitality can be seen as an interruption of this individualistic tradition of self. The chapter offers a quick overview of Levinas' work and moves then towards exploring Levinas' and Derrida's ideas of *welcoming* as orientation towards

the other. Their description of ethical subjectivity as a continuum²²² of hosting and guesting calls attention to the interplay between saying welcome *to* the other, and receiving the welcome *of* the other (other's welcome).²²³ The chapter weaves together Derrida's and Levinas' discussions on unconditional hospitality and Spivak's postcolonial critique of emancipatory approaches that silence other ways of knowing and being in the world. In the course of the chapter I suggest that the call for openness towards alterity voiced by postcolonial philosophers can help us to rethink host-guest relations in community participation.

The fourth chapter traces the methodological path of the study by explaining the leaps that I make between the theoretical discussions and my empirical context. By leaps I refer here to the different phases of the ethnographic research process where, as tourism scholar Outi Rantala²²⁴ suggests, textual, written and physical fields become intertwined. The chapter begins by calling attention to the previous efforts to decolonize research methodologies and moving towards methodological discussions that acknowledge one's privilege and positionality. I describe here how my understandings of ethicality and responsibility in conducting academic research continued to change during my three different field visits to Nicaragua. The third part of the chapter explains in detail how I analyse the empirical data: drawing inspiration from hermeneutical phenomenology, I explore how the hosts and guests welcomed each other into the spaces of dialogue – into spaces of participation. Before moving on to actual written representations of my analysis, I finish the chapter by calling attention again to the perils and limitations of speaking for, and speaking about, the other.

Chapter 5 takes the discussions of unconditional and conditional hospitality into the Nicaraguan context. The purpose of the chapter is to offer my interpretation of the historical, political and social context in which the contemporary tourism development encounters take place. Hence, I ask how the historical context might be shaping the ongoing negotiations of local

222 See also Rosello 2001, 18, 118.

223 Derrida AEL 1999, 21-9.

224 Rantala 2011b.

participation in tourism. I begin by describing how the pervasive images of foreign interventions, natural catastrophes and poverty in Nicaragua have recently been enriched with touristic imaginaries²²⁵ of exotic nature, volcanoes, pristine beaches and warm Nicaraguan hospitality. The chapter discusses how, and by whom, tourism development has been welcomed, firstly to Nicaragua, secondly to the rural areas of the country, and thirdly to the farming communities of San Ramón. While rural tourism strategies and development officials seem to celebrate warm Nicaraguan hospitality, the early years of tourism development in San Ramón show that communities sought to calculate and negotiate the risks and responsibilities of welcoming tourism. Although rural communities are seemingly included in rural tourism development, local hosts' concerns become easily overlooked. The chapter claims that even participatory tourism strategies tend to take for granted an unconditional welcome on the part of local communities.

The sixth chapter approaches tourism development encounters from the point of view of the local hosts in San Ramón. The focus here is on the local hosts' experiences of the encounters where the conditions, risks and responsibilities of tourism development have been negotiated, asking how material conditions in particular might keep shaping these negotiations between self and other. Although the local hosts in San Ramón appreciated the help that they received from tourism experts during the early phases of tourism development, the hosts found the continuous demand for material improvements to be exhausting. I use the example of an international tourism development programme called *Moderniza* as an extreme example of a tourism project in which the guests defined and evaluated the material requirements needed in successful tourism enterprises. After a decade of tourism development, the local hosts felt that they were nearly silenced in their own homes by their guests. As a result, both sides of Levinasian idea of ethics and hospitality were missing: on the one hand, tourism experts did not welcome the locals in discourse and, on the other, the local hosts decided to make their welcome towards tourism experts more conditional.

225 For a conceptual approach to tourism imaginaries, see Salazar 2010.

The seventh chapter, the last part of the analysis, changes the perspective from dwelling in unwelcoming encounters towards imagining alternative and more welcoming ways of doing togetherness. The purpose of the chapter is, first, to envision what open and hospitable spaces between hosts and guests could be like and, second, to discuss how these kinds of spaces could be created and promoted in future encounters. The data used for the analysis primarily consists of local hosts' descriptions of positive face-to-face encounters that have taken place in San Ramón. In light of the analysis, and reflecting on my own experiences about open encounters, the chapter focuses on the questions of sharing one's space, experiences and, above all, one's time with the other. Drawing on Levinas' and Derrida's²²⁶ discussions of hospitality as 'interrupting self', the chapter suggests that the main prerequisite for ethical encounters might be a readiness to question one's freedom as a spontaneous, individual subject. In sum, the chapter asks how creating more open and ethical spaces between self and other requires a readiness to unlearn one's pre-conceptions and privileges and learn anew the significance of the word 'welcome'.

The concluding chapter summarizes how the privileged tourists, developers and academics tend to visit rural communities with expectations of infinite and completely open hospitality on the part of the 'other'. At the same time, the self's responsibility to welcome and receive become neglected. The tendency of taking for granted that the other welcomes self, although the latter does not say 'welcome' *to* the former, can be seen as a sign of a colonized imagination and heightened levels of individualism. Instead of being surprised that the Levinasian utopia of unconditional welcoming does not seem to reflect the lived experiences in tourism development encounters, I consider his approach to responsibility and receptivity as the fundamental structure of subjectivity to be a valuable goal to aspire to – and yet, inevitably, fall short of – when encountering multiple others.²²⁷ By taking the discussions to another level of abstraction, I conclude here that such premises may undermine the search and promises of developing ethically

226 See, for instance, Levinas T&I 1969, 39; Derrida AEL 1999, 51-2.

227 Baker 2013; Höckert 2014.

sound encounters and representations within tourism; that is, they base the debates and practices of participation on self-centred, or solipsist, ontologies which might be more likely to maintain than disrupt the dualistic distinctions between self and other.²²⁸ An additional ambition of the concluding chapter is to address the limitations of the research and to discuss the need for further exploration in tourism within the participatory paradigm.

228 Dredge & Hales 2012.

2 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

In recent decades *community participation* has become an important orientation in the search for more sustainable, democratic or responsible forms of tourism development. An increasing number of tourism scholars have begun to put forward practical grounds for local participation in tourism development. The discussions in the participatory paradigm have called for greater inclusion of local people's perspectives, priorities, skills, and knowledge as an alternative approach to outsider-led development.²²⁹ Thus, while the mainstream tourism debates are still saturated with a focus on goals of modernization and economic growth, a counterpoint is found in small-scale, locally based development. In fact, the principle of community participation as such calls attention to asymmetrical opportunities to participate. What is more, it implies that very often local communities have been left out of the planning and decision-making processes of tourism development.²³⁰ The underlying assumption of community participation is that people should be actively involved and given the opportunity to shape their own destinies rather than simply having the role of passive recipients of the fruits of development programmes or the tourism industries in general.²³¹ While some tourism scholars have suggested that the hosts can reap real benefits from tourism only when they are accepted as agents of their own development, there are others who have been more sceptical

229 McEwan 2009, 232; see also Jamal & Dredge 2014.

230 Mowforth & Munt 2003, 212; Tosun 2005; Tuulentie & Mettinen 2007; Pleumarom 2012.

231 For participation in development, see Chambers 1983; For self-determination and freedom in development, see Sen 1999.

about the real benefits and possibilities of including rural communities in tourism development.²³²

The purpose of this chapter is to explore previous research on community participation and to address those strands of research which my own study draws from and aims to contribute to. The chapter argues that while community participation is often perceived as a relatively new idea in tourism, the conceptualization of participation actually derives from a rich, and even contradictory, legacy of ideas and practical agendas. The argument proceeds in three parts. In order to consider the contemporary context of community participation in development thinking, I begin with a short trip along the history of participatory theories in *development studies*. I find it important to begin from development studies in order to locate the call for community participation, locally owned and grassroots-level development in the context of competing development ideologies.²³³ Contemporary literature in development studies connects the idea of community participation primarily to the *alternative development paradigm*, which arose in the 1970s and 1980s as a response to the dominance of the *neoliberal idea of economic development*.²³⁴ These two paradigms can be located in the historical evolution of development theories which have appeared, always as a reaction against the previous paradigm, after the Second World War. The commonly agreed five main theories are: *modernization, dependency theory, economic neoliberalism, alternative development and post-development*.²³⁵ Recent years have seen an increasing amount of post-development literature, which questions and rejects the dominance of Eurocentric worldviews on development and called for inclusion of multiple worldviews.²³⁶ While some scholars have suggested local participation as a way to question the Western dominance in development, some have argued that participatory approaches are for

232 For research on possibilities of community participation in tourism, see Hall 2003; Swarbrooke 2002, 123; Telfer 2003; 169; Shen et al. 2008, 7; for limitations and critique, see Li 2006; Simpson 2008; Butcher 2012.

233 Telfer 2014, 57-9; see also Kadu 1979; Telfer 2009; Jänis 2011; Scheyvens 2011.

234 Nelson & Wright 1997; Cooke & Kothari 2001; Telfer 2003, 158-161; de Vylder 2006; Vihemäki 2009.

235 de Vylder 2006; Todaro & Smith 2006; Telfer 2009.

236 Escobar 2012; Telfer 2009.

the most part used to continue that dominance. Hence, the purpose of the first section is to offer an overview of different approaches on community participation. Moreover, the overview indicates that the contemporary debates on community participation have seriously ignored, among other things, the more radical roots of participation.

The second section of the chapter takes a closer look at the emergence of the participatory paradigm in *tourism research* in the 1980s, as part of the alternative development paradigm. I sketch the different types of studies on community participation in tourism, especially those which have been conducted in the Latin American context. The section offers an overview of how the concepts of community-based tourism, indigenous tourism and ecotourism have become defined in connection with local participation and examines the previous discussions on the key concepts of community, participation, empowerment and local knowledge. These discussions indicate the slippery nature of these concepts. However, instead of embracing the messiness of human relations – my main concern – tourism researchers have often been focused on creating better instruments for managing and organizing participation. Moving then to the third part of the literature review, I concentrate on the different roles hosts and guests take on in the development of participatory tourism. By doing so, I call attention to previous studies that have focused on the relations between rural communities and tourism experts. My assessment is that many community participation debates have become bogged down arguing whether local communities should participate or not. In fact, the most critical voices have condemned the discourses of participation as a whole as a failure. Paradoxically, the importance of including local communities tends to be advocated for by parties other than the communities themselves. This approach keeps the communities in a position of guests – guests who might, or might not, be invited to participate. These rather instrumental and pragmatic points of view on participation have neglected the rich history of ideological and ethical discussions behind the idea of doing, knowing and being together. Hence, I conclude the chapter by drawing attention to previous research in tourism that address and aim to correct this oversight.

2.1 Genealogy of participation in development theories

Introductory courses in development studies describe the idea of ‘development’ as an offspring of Western-led modernization processes in the 20th century.²³⁷ Consequently, the idea of local participation has been seen as a critique of Western, top-down development projects. However, some development studies scholars begin telling the history of development and participation from a much earlier date.²³⁸ For example, John Cohen and Norman Uphoff²³⁹ have pointed out that questions about the relationships between participation and social and human development have been around at least since Aristotle, who analyzed which arrangements in the Greek city-states most likely contributed to human happiness and *the good life*. In Aristotle’s view, the best state in the final analysis was one with broad participation, without any class dominating the others. According to Cohen and Uphoff²⁴⁰, the conditions for Aristotle’s ‘best state’ were similar to those commonly associated with development: a reasonably equitable distribution of wealth and widespread education. By contrast, Henkel and Stirrat²⁴¹ propose that the historic roots of the concept of participation could be connected to the *bourgeois emancipation in Europe* in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. They suggest that an alternative genealogy of participation can be found in the *Reformation*, where the idea of ‘participation’ became significant on the level of theology and evangelical promises of salvation. Hence, participation can be seen to have far-reaching meanings involving a specific vision of society as *communitas*.²⁴²

In their review of historical perspectives on ‘participation’ in development theories, Cornwall and Brock²⁴³ argue that by remaining ‘politically

237 Sachs 1992; Easterley 2006; Tilalle Escobar 2012, 3-12; Escobar & Mignolo 2011.

238 For instance, Mezzadra, Reid & Ranabbir (2013, 3 drawing on Sanyal 2007) train the focus on the relation between the discourse of development and essentialized liberalism since the 17th and 18th centuries.

239 Cohen & Uphoff 2011, 34.

240 Ibid. 35.

241 Henkel & Stirrat 2001, 170.

242 Ibid. 172.

243 Cornwall & Brock 2005, 1046.

ambiguous and definitionally vague participation has historically been used both to enable ordinary people to gain agency and as means of maintaining relations of rule'. While acknowledging the importance of the pioneers of participatory ideology, I follow here most closely development scholar Andrea Cornwall's²⁴⁴ research, which traces the roots of contemporary community participation theories to different theoretical strands and connections that have emerged since the 1940s. In the following, I take a look at the ways in which previous research has referred to two different streams of thought as the antecedents of contemporary theories on community participation. The first consists of Western ideologies and political theories of modernization, and the second one has been traced to the more radical roots of liberation pedagogy and dependency theory in Latin America.

Firstly, as Stiefel and Wolfe²⁴⁵ describe, the Western idea of participation can be connected to the idea of a *pluralist representative democracy*. This idea of electoral participation includes an underlying consensus that allows all major social groups to feel represented within the system. However, more commonly, participation has been discussed in the context of community development, which is interpreted as a way to transform 'traditional' populations into modern ones.²⁴⁶ Postcolonial critiques in particular have described the unambiguous relationship between the origins of community development and colonial approaches, making participation a less radical or alternative development strategy than is often presented.²⁴⁷ Mayo²⁴⁸ claims that colonialism – and its dual mandate to civilize while exploiting – itself created the climate in which community development was to take shape. For instance, Leal²⁴⁹ and Midgley²⁵⁰, have traced the past history of the idea of community participation to the first community development projects

244 Cornwall 2006; 2011.

245 Stiegel & Wolfe 1994/2011, 20.

246 Greig et al. 2007, 234; Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 82.

247 Nederveen Pieterse 2001, 75; Cornwall 2006 in McEwan 2009, 234; Greig et al. 2007, 23; Leal 2010, 90; Midgley 2011, 174.

248 Mayo 1975 in Midgley 2011, 174.

249 Stiegel & Wolfe, 2010, 90.

250 Midgley 2011, 174.

run by missionaries and colonial officials. Greig, Hulme and Turner²⁵¹ also argue that community development projects in India in the 1940s could be seen as the starting point for postcolonial community development.

The majority of development historians have agreed that the process of ‘bridging the gaps’ between ‘traditional’ societies and modern, developed nations began after the Second World War, when the more industrialized countries became concerned about the problems of ‘underdevelopment’.²⁵² United States’ president Harry S. Truman’s inaugural address in 1949 is often named as the starting point for a new era of interventions and development.²⁵³ By declaring the Southern Hemisphere an ‘underdeveloped area’, Truman ‘discovered’ the two billion poor, underdeveloped people who needed to follow North America and Europe as models on their development path. Above all, the homogenous group of the ‘underdeveloped’ living in the Southern Hemisphere needed to be helped with Western technical solutions.²⁵⁴ While the material advancement was viewed as the only way to achieve cultural, social and political development, alternatives were left out of the development discourse.

By the 1960s, the focus and the efforts of foreign assistance were turned from technologies to *resource* gaps.²⁵⁵ The people were expected to participate according to the Western rationalist tradition as disciplined and rational economic actors, investing, saving and producing goods and capital for their national economies.²⁵⁶ For example, Rostow’s stages of economic growth – the stages leading all humankind from being a primitive society to Western industrialized modernity – focused on entrepreneurship and capital. According to Stiefel and Wolfe’s²⁵⁷ seminal analysis of the many faces of participation, the advocates of a ‘modern’ and ‘efficient’ social order generally devalued traditional community and extended family ties as forms

251 Greig et al. 2007, 234.

252 Cohen & Upphoff 2011, 36; see also Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007.

253 Cornwall 2006, 69-70; de Vylder 2006, 26; Easterley 2006, 21; Escobar 2012, 3, 35-6.

254 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 82.

255 Ibid.; Cohen & Upphoff 2011, 36.

256 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 82.

257 Stiefel & Wolfe 1994/2011, 22.

of participation. By the 1970s the Western bias of community development as a tool for modernization had lost a good deal of its credibility, especially through the rise of dependency theory and through the critique of aid as a neo-colonial project within the globalization of capitalism.²⁵⁸

Secondly, the radical roots of contemporary participation theory can be found in anthropological critiques of development, particularly those which evolved in the 1960s and 1970s from the Latin American *dependistas*²⁵⁹, from Paulo Freire's liberation pedagogy and Gramsci's neo-Marxism. These approaches called attention to how mainstream development efforts tended to perpetuate dependency and to reinforce structures of inequality with the 'Third World' – a view that was informed much of Freire's work.²⁶⁰ Freire's notion of 'culture of silence' in Latin America was based initially on the conquest by the Spanish and Portuguese, and later on the domination by the US.²⁶¹ According to Freire²⁶² it was necessary to analyze the connections between the culture of silence and the culture that has a voice. While Freire considered the economic dependence obvious, he called attention to the educational system, which serves the status quo. Berkhöfer and Berkhöfer²⁶³ explain that 'especially his *Pedagogy of Oppressed* (1970/2000), when translated into development context, implied a radical critique of mainstream development thinking.' According to Freire²⁶⁴:

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing, projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry.

258 Ibid.; Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 83.

259 For dependistas and the dependency theory, see Grossfoguel 2008, 307-34; Escobar 2012, 80-1; See also Telfer 2009, 154-5.

260 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 83.

261 Närman 2006, 99.

262 Freire 1972 in Närman 2006, 99; See also McEwan 2009, 232; Dussel 2013, 311-20;

263 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 83.

264 Freire 2000, 72.

Leal²⁶⁵ explains that the purpose of the emancipatory pedagogy of Freire, like that of neo-Marxist thought, was not development or poverty reduction as such, but the transformation of the cultural, political, and economic structures which reproduce poverty and marginalization. Freire's²⁶⁶ concept and practice of *popular education*, based on *conscientisation*, was aimed at raising awareness of social realities and in this way breaking the silence. According to him, when oppressed persons begin looking critically at the world through joint dialogue, they will no longer accept the status quo of society, but will become subjects reacting more actively by questioning surrounding social forces.²⁶⁷ The first Sandinista period in Nicaragua, in 1979-1990, has been seen as one of the concrete examples where Freire's thought was applied in order to transform a country's educational system.²⁶⁸

In the early 1970s, these radical roots of participation theory existed simultaneously with other forms of dissatisfaction towards mainstream development models, which then turned into a search for more people-oriented approaches.²⁶⁹ Cornwall²⁷⁰, Berkhöfer and Berkhöfer²⁷¹ point out that in the 1970s the concerns for project efficiency, political empowerment and mutual learning were all voiced at the same time, which meant that there were co-existing divergent understandings of participation. For instance, in 1974, the UN Charter of 'Economic Rights and Obligations of States' instituted economic, political and cultural pluralism at the highest political level; this was the pluralism that stressed the interpretation of participation as a mutual learning experience among 'equals'.²⁷² James Midgley²⁷³, among others, explains the ways in which the more recent idea of *community participation* then evolved, at least partly, in response to criticism of the colonial nature of *community development* as a tool for modernization.

265 Leal 2011, 71.

266 Freire 1970/2000.

267 Närman 2006, 99.

268 Ibid. 100.

269 Brohman 1996b in Telfer 2014, 54.

270 Cornwall 2006, 63-5.

271 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 84.

272 Ibid.

273 Midgley 2011, 174.

The links to the antecedents of *community participation* could be distinguished, at least at one time, by using specific concepts, such as, community development, the community development movement and community radicalism. However, following an examination of the plurality of theoretical and philosophical discussions on participation, Cornwall's and others' research indicates a lack of consensus about the theoretical backgrounds of contemporary participatory development theories. Interestingly, as Stiefel and Wolfe²⁷⁴ have argued, the later discourses on participation have paid only sporadic attention to the long historical evolution of theories and practices of democracy, co-operation and communitarian and socialist utopias from which the hopes for participation had earlier been derived. Instead, the formation of participatory approaches, in development studies as much as in tourism research, has been based primarily on participatory experiences in Western societies.²⁷⁵ This has resulted in not only a rather limited idea of participation, but also discontinuity of learned lessons and theoretical debates. Especially the connections of participation to the more radical roots of social transformation – such as Freire's liberation pedagogy – were somewhat forgotten when the *community participation* approach was discovered by the mainstream in the late 1980s and 1990s, that is, when community participation became considered a core component of what is known as the *alternative development theory*.²⁷⁶

During the 1980s, NGOs in particular gained importance in locally organized development efforts. In their research on the populist idea of community participation, Berkhöfer and Berkhöfer²⁷⁷ explain that while NGOs were seen as cheaper and closer to the people than (inter)national organizations, this belief coincided with the new trend in downsizing the state apparatus. In their view, the new calls for NGO-driven participation provided a convenient support for 'rolling back the state', proposing structural adjustment and privatization of what had been public provision

274 Stiefel & Wolfe 1994, 22; 2011, 19.

275 Tosun 2005.

276 Cooke & Kothari 2001, 5; Greig, Hulme & Turner 2007, 233-6

277 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 84.

of welfare and services.²⁷⁸ Participation was then, in their opinion, conveniently perceived as a community's contribution to an aid project for its own benefit. Also Leal²⁷⁹, in his analysis of the ascendancy of participation as a buzzword, points out that it was hardly a coincidence that the idea of community participation in development appeared as a new battle horse for official development during the riots against the implementation of neo-liberalism in the 'developing world' and for spreading the shock treatment of Structural Adjustment Programs run by the World Bank and the IMF. In this situation official development found in participation what Majid Rahnema²⁸⁰ called as 'a redeeming saint'. This meant, that development's earlier failures were explained by its top down, blueprint mechanics, which were to be replaced by more people-friendly, bottom-up approaches.

Throughout the greater part of the 1990s, the notion of participation stood side by side with giants such as 'sustainable development', 'basic needs' and 'capacity building'.²⁸¹ As a growing number of governments and international development agencies recognized the important role of local-level organizations and local-level knowledge, participation entered the 'exclusive world of dominant development discourse' and became an orthodox concept.²⁸² Leal²⁸³, among others, describe how the development consultants and professionals 'rushed to attend workshops on how to employ a multiplicity of participatory methodologies such as Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). The participatory trend was cited upon by Robert Chamber's *Rural Development, Putting the Last First*, in 1983, and by Cernea's *Putting People First*, almost ten years later.²⁸⁴ Another central publication on participation was Stiefel's and Wolfe's *A Voice for the Excluded: Popular Participation in Development – Utopia or Necessity?*, published in 1994. This book was seen as the culmination of a longitudinal research programme on

278 Ibid.

279 Leal 2010, 90; 2011, 73.

280 Rahnema 1990, 20 in Leal 2010, 91.

281 On the ascendancy of participation, see Leal's 2010.

282 On the ascendancy and contemporary use of participation, see Henkel & Stirrat 2001, 170; Greig et al. 2007, 236; Cornwall 2006.

283 Leal 2010.

284 Cernea 1991.

popular participation, run by United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). All these publications shared a common series of themes that stressed the importance of ‘bottom up’ approaches, empowerment, supporting the marginal, distrust of the state and the celebration of ‘local’ or ‘indigenous’ knowledges.²⁸⁵

As a result from community participation’s peak in the 1990s²⁸⁶, Cooke and Kothari²⁸⁷ put out their anthology on participation titled *The New Tyranny?*. Their book, published in 2001, drew attention to the risks of facilitating unjust and illegitimate use of power in the name of participation. They raised the question whether the focus on methodological limitations of participation might have been obscuring the more fundamental problems within the development discourse. Cooke and Kothari²⁸⁸ asserted that the problems associated with the orthodoxy of participatory development and the application of participatory practices did not lie with methodology or techniques, but with politics and discourses. Like Cooke and Kothari, other development scholars engaged in a critical examination of the populist rhetoric of involving local people – the ordinary folk who are ‘badly done by’ – in social development.²⁸⁹ For instance, post-development thinkers, such as Escobar²⁹⁰ and Nederween Pieterse²⁹¹, asked whether saying that development must be undertaken from within, and geared to basic needs, might have been an alternative to the state and market, but not necessarily to the general discourse of developmentalism. In order to move beyond developmentalist ideas of ‘I manage, you participate’, Saxena²⁹² prompted development practitioners to ask questions such: Why participate? Who participates? What are the outcomes and indicators of participation? When to participate?. The last of

285 Henkel & Stirrat 2001, 170-1.

286 Cornwall, 2011, xii.

287 See also McEwan, 2009, 234.

288 Cooke & Kothari 2001, 7.

289 Midgley (2011, 173) writes that the current community participation theory suggests that ordinary people would have in general been excluded from the political affairs and development progress.

290 Escobar 1995, 15.

291 Nederween Pieterse 2001, 76; for more on developmentalism, see Eriksson Baaz 2005; Grosfoguel 2008; Riddell 2008; Escobar 2012, 11.

292 Saxena 1998/2011.

Saxena's questions highlights the paradox of treating participation as a tap which can be turned off and turned on by researchers or development officials.

Berkhöfer and Berkhöfer²⁹³ conclude that the past forty years of development experience have produced:

... a higher awareness of the complexities involved, and ongoing specialization of tools and methods to deal with a sporadic ambivalence about the due roles of external development workers/ consultants/ experts, and an overall adherence to an a-political management-oriented stance.

Despite the critique and scepticism, many development scholars have sought to move from the tyranny of participation towards rescuing the transformative potential of participatory approaches.²⁹⁴ In their analysis of previous discussions on participation, Hickey and Mohan²⁹⁵ encourage scholars to be careful not to throw the baby out with the bathwater and totally discard the idea of participation as such. Development scholars, such as Leal²⁹⁶, have recently drawn attention to the somewhat forgotten or neglected roots of radical social transformation in the 1960s and 1970s. In Leal's²⁹⁷ view, there exists a need to return to alternative constructs of 'the good life'. He writes:

The recovery of the emancipatory meaning of participation implies re-grounding the radical roots of liberatory/popular education and participatory action research, to re-situate the transformative proposal in the twenty-first century neo-liberal world order, and reconstruct the spaces and culture for participation and the exercise of popular power.²⁹⁸

293 Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 85.

294 See for instance, Hickey & Mohan 2004; McEwan 2009, 231-5.

295 Ibid.; see also Leal 2011, 77.

296 Leal 2011.

297 Ibid., drawing on Fals-Borda 2000.

298 Ibid., 79.

Moving from development studies to tourism research, it merits mention that recent *ethical* and *critical turns* in tourism have been opening new spaces for envisioning alternative forms of development or well-being.²⁹⁹ I will take a look at these discussions in the third section (2.3) of this chapter, after first taking a more general look at previous academic discussions on community participation in tourism.

2.2 Inclusion of local communities in tourism development

In tourism studies the call for community participation emerged more than three decades ago. It appeared as a response to the numerous tourism impact studies and residents' attitude surveys which indicated that only few positive impacts accrued to the host communities.³⁰⁰ In 1978, the multiple concerns about the social and cultural impacts of host-guest encounters in tourism were addressed in Valene Smith's edited collection *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology*. The imbalance between what were few positive and various negative social, cultural, and environmental impacts in tourism destinations created a need for more host-friendly practices in tourism policies and practices, as Hall³⁰¹ express it. One of the first serious discussions and analyses of the need for national and local participation in tourism planning in developing countries emerged in 1979 in de Kadt's anthology *Tourism: Passport to Development?*, and was followed by the work of Jenkins in 1982, Mathieson and Wall also in 1982³⁰², and Gow and Vanant³⁰³ one year later. These studies pointed out that the tourism sector was marked by little public involvement in tourism planning and that public concerns should be incorporated into

299 For examples within tourism studies that impel us to recognize the ways in which we understand development or progress, see Matarrita-Cascante 2010; Pritchard et al. 2011; Caton 2012; Dredge et al. 2013; Tucker 2014; Veijola et al. 2014.

300 Cohen, E. 1979a; Keogh 1990, 450; Tosun 2000, 616.

301 Hall 2000 in Saarinen 2010, 715.

302 Mathieson & Wall 1982, 181.

303 Gow & Wanant, 1983.

decision-making processes. de Kadt³⁰⁴, drawing on Freire's work, acknowledged the challenges of the community-based approach to tourism as follows:

For community interests to be taken into account in tourism (or any other) development, it is essential that those interests be articulated from the moment potential projects are identified. That usually means that somehow local people have to be helped to grasp the issues from *their* point of view, by a process of education and increasing self-awareness that Latin Americans have come to call *conscientización*.

As an example of the different kinds of challenges related to such encouragement of local participation in tourism, de Kadt referred to a longitudinal study conducted in the 1970s by Reynoso y Valle's and de Regt³⁰⁵ on a 'Community Development team' in fishing communities in Ixtapa and Zihuantajeno, in Mexico. Among other things, their study highlighted the fact ways in which tourism projects can have a significant effect on local communities even before the tourists begin to arrive in numbers.

As the idea to include local communities surged from the various problems in destination areas, the involvement of local communities was seen as one of the solutions to continue with development of tourism product in 'harmony with the local environment and its people'.³⁰⁶ As brought up in the introduction of this study, Murphy³⁰⁷ is normally mentioned as the first tourism scholar to call for more community-oriented approaches in tourism development and planning.³⁰⁸ His book *Tourism, A Community Approach*, published in 1985 was one of the first which examined and stressed that the goals of tourism development should satisfy local communities living in destination areas.³⁰⁹ Therefore, Murphy's pioneer work has been perceived as a catalyst and platform for the later discussions of local participation in

304 de Kadt 1979, 27.

305 Ibid. 134.

306 See Murphy 1985

307 Ibid. 1985, 1988.

308 Telfer 2003; see e.g. Cole 2006.

309 Ibid. 2003, 244.

tourism.³¹⁰ His call for decentralizing tourism development and integrating it more into community-defined goals, inspired many tourism scholars in the 1990s.³¹¹ In addition Krippendorf's *The Holidaymakers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel*³¹² played a central role in drawing attention to the importance of communities' well-being in tourism development.³¹³

Ever since tourism researchers and practitioners have laid emphasis on developing less reactive, more integrative, approaches to tourism planning.³¹⁴ Unlike the previous business models based mainly on supply and demand, the focus of this stream of research was on the meaningfulness of local participation, especially in rural areas.³¹⁵ However, in my view, a considerable amount of participatory planning literature has shared Murphy's³¹⁶ concern that resistance or hostility of local population can actually destroy the industry's potential altogether.³¹⁷ In this approach the role of the local communities is rather instrumental: active participation of the local population is seen to guarantee tourism development. For instance, Murphy's³¹⁸ argument on how 'tourism relies on the goodwill and cooperation of local people because they are part of the product' includes an assumption that successful tourism activities require local support. However, a growing number of tourism researchers have sought to move the focus from promoting tourism industries towards more holistic understandings of *how* tourism activities might contribute to the multiple goals of development and well-being in different contexts.³¹⁹

310 Simpson 2008, 333.

311 Timothy 2002, 149; in the 1990s, Long, Prentice, Simmons, and Brohman were among the first tourism scholars who built on Murphy's research.

312 Krippendorf, 1987.

313 Butcher 2007, 63.

314 Reid, Mair & George 2004, 625; and see also Reid, Fuller, Haywood & Bryden 1993; Pearce, Moscardo & Ross, 1996; Tuulentie & Mettinen 2007; King & Pearlman 2009, 419-21.

315 Reid et al. 2004, 625.

316 Murphy 1985.

317 For studies that locate tourism development as the principle purpose of participatory planning, see Gets 1983, 87; Potts & Harrill 1998; Fennell & Przeclawski 2003.

318 Murphy 1985, 153.

319 Jamal & Getz 1995; Tosun 2002; Reid et al. 2004; Dredge & Hales 2012.

After this short outline of birth of participatory approaches in tourism research, I now turn to different kinds of labels and concepts that have been used to describe the idea of local participation in tourism development. Tourism whose main focus is on the well-being of local communities has generally been called *sustainable tourism* or, more specifically, *community-based tourism*.³²⁰ In his analysis of sustainability and participation in tourism development, Dallen J. Timothy³²¹ argued, in 2002, that:

‘Community-based tourism is a more sustainable form of development than conventional forms of mass tourism because it allows host communities to break away from the hegemonic grasp of tour operators and the oligopoly of wealthy elites at the national level.’

Most commonly the idea of local participation has been connected to tourism development which is *small in scale* and based on *respectful use of local resources*³²²; or, as Saarinen³²³ suggests, ‘participation is a condition for *community-control* and *ownership*’. Especially in Latin America the concept of *rural community-based tourism* is used to refer to small-scale tourism in rural areas, where the local communities are in control of tourism development.³²⁴

Ernest Cañada and Jordi Gascón³²⁵ have been among the main advocates of the rural community-based tourism in Central America, with a special focus on economic impacts and food security related to tourism development. These tourism scholars and social activists promote community-based tourism as voicing opposition to the conventional forms of mass tourism and the Western-based tourism industries’.³²⁶ The main goal of rural

320 See for instance Saarinen 2006; 2010; Telfer 2009; Tuulentie & Sarkki 2009; Höckert 2009; Höckert et al 2013; Jamal & Dredge 2014.

321 Timothy 2002, 150.

322 Jamal & Getz 1995; Scheyvens 2002; Tuulentie & Sarkki 2009.

323 Saarinen 2010, 716.

324 For discussions on the significance of community-based tourism in Nicaragua in particular, see Cañada & Izaskun, 2004; Cañada et al. 2006; Cañada & Gascón 2007b; Höckert 2009; Perez et al. 2010; Cañada 2011; Zapata et al. 2011; McRoberts 2012.

325 Cañada & Gascón 2007ab; Cañada 2010, 2011; See also Cañada & Izaskun 2004;

326 Ibid.; See also Wearing & McDonald 2002, 201.

community-based tourism, according to Cañada and Gascón³²⁷, is to *reduce income poverty, vulnerability and isolation* by diversifying, not by replacing, the traditional income sources of rural communities. They also highlight that rural community-based tourism should not be directly copied from outside, since tourism developments are very situational and the potential for local involvement varies a great deal from place to place.³²⁸ Rural community-based tourism can also be seen as an opportunity to ensure that farmers' land will not be sold, for instance to foreign tourism investors. In my own research I build in particular on previous research on the ways in which rural and marginalized groups participate in tourism development in Nicaragua.³²⁹

In addition to community-based tourism, *ecotourism* and *indigenous tourism* are commonly used concepts which draw attention to the alternative ways of developing tourism. These conceptualizations are also highlighted in studies on sustainable tourism development in Latin America.³³⁰ One example of these studies is Alison M. Johnston's³³¹ analysis on the evolution of ecotourism mega-programs in Central America called *La Ruta Maya* and *Mundo Maya*. The programs were born in the late 1980s and they involved cooperation of many national governments and international development organizations, including the IMF and the World Bank. Through her analysis, Johnston³³² discusses, similarly to other studies on indigenous tourism, the ambiguity of participatory rhetoric and the *conservation of natural and cultural resources*. For instance, Amanda Stronza's longitudinal study on a community-based ecotourism initiative in the Peruvian Amazon, carried out between 1999 and 2009, explores the wide range of socioeconomic and cultural changes that arise in the relationships between different actors. Jamal

327 Cañada & Gascón 2007b, 87.

328 Ibid., 74.

329 These studies include, above of all, Cañada et al. 2006; Pérez et al. 2010; Cañada 2011; Zapata et al. 2011; McRoberts 2012.

330 See Quesada's (2014) research on 'Sustainable Tourism Planning, and the Demolition Conflict in the South Caribbean Coastal Area of Costa Rica'. The issues of ecotourism and indigenous tourism are also brought together by Dahles & Keune (ed.) 2002.

331 Johnston 2006.

332 Jamal & Dredge 2014, 190; Quesada 2014.

and Stronza's³³³ analysis 'Cultural relationships in local-global spaces', which draws on Heidegger's notions of dwelling and care, argues that these kinds of tourism initiatives can be seen as complex performative spaces where values and interests are constantly *negotiated, shaped and resisted*.

Although case-studies on community participation highlight the importance of local control in tourism development, the same studies address the ambiguity of defining the concepts of *community* and *participation* in practice.³³⁴ Tourism researchers Richards and Hall³³⁵ point out that already in the 1960s there were dozens of identifiable ways of defining community. Dredge, Hales and Jamal's³³⁶ analysis on community case study research in tourism also illustrates how 'community' may be defined in a variety of ways; that is, the idea of community can be used to refer to a group of people who share a spatial place, ethnic, cultural or professional characteristics or, for instance, common beliefs, attitudes, interests, identities or other types of connections. Urry³³⁷, too, suggests that community does not refer only to a community living in a certain topographical location, but embraces ideas, ideologies and feelings of community, 'communitas' and togetherness. There is a consensus among social scientists that people can be simultaneously embedded in different kinds of communities in various ways. Those engaged with community case studies in tourism, as Dredge et al.³³⁸ suggest, could embrace this heterogeneity and messiness as a source of fascination, instead of trying to simplify communities which are inevitably complex and diffuse.³³⁹

In order to understand and explain how people *participate* in tourism development, many tourism researchers, have drawn on Arnstein's (1969), Pretty's (1995), and France's (1998) typologies of participation. The first of

333 Jamal & Stronza 2008.

334 Popple 2000; Johnston 2006; van der Duim et al. 2006; Mettinen et al. 2009.

335 In their analysis Richards & Hall (2003, 2) refer to research by Hillary in 1955.

336 Dredge et al. 2013.

337 Urry 1990; see also Richards & Hall 2003, 2.

338 Dredge et al. 2013, 33-5.

339 For arguments in the same vein, see Cole 2006, 95; Veijola et al. 2014.

these, Arnstein's³⁴⁰ eight steps of citizen participation, presents that while the bottom rungs of participation are mainly manipulation or therapy, the eighth rung means citizen control where the have-nots have most of the decision-making seats or managerial control. However, he points out that his typology fails to address the roadblocks to participation. In his view the roadblocks on the power-holder's side include racism, paternalism and distribution of power and, on the economically marginalized communities' side, an inadequate political infrastructure and knowledge base.³⁴¹ The second typology, Pretty's³⁴² six types of participation, ranges from the first level – passive participation – at which people are told what has been already decided and what has happened, to the sixth level's self-mobilization, in which people have full control, taking initiatives as well as developing contacts independently. The third typology of participation, the Frances' taxonomy, builds on the work of Pretty. In his research, Frances³⁴³ addresses the issue of empowerment and argues that not all kinds of participation lead to empowerment. Instead, empowerment might happen only on the top end of Pretty's participation ladder, where individuals, groups or communities are in charge of and determine their own goals and affairs.³⁴⁴

In fact, the conceptualization of *empowerment* also belongs to the very heart of the participatory paradigm. In her review study on community participation and empowerment, Cole³⁴⁵ suggests that, on the highest level in the ladder of participation, local people become active agents of change, can find solutions to their own problems, make decisions, implement actions and also evaluate the solutions they adopt. The preliminary work on (eco) tourism and empowerment was undertaken in the 1990s by Arai³⁴⁶ and

340 Arnstein 1969; Tosun 2000 has based his analysis on local participation on Arnstein's degrees of citizen power, which include partnership, delegated power and citizen control. See also Cornwall 2011, xiii; Ganem-Cuenca 2011, 39–41.

341 Arnstein 1969, 5; See also Telfer & Shapley 2008, 129.

342 Pretty 1995; for examples on studies that draw from Pretty's typology, see Telfer 2003; Höckert 2009.

343 Frances 1998; for examples on studies that draw from Frances, see Timothy 2002.

344 Timothy 2002, 152; Cole 2006, 97; Höckert 2009; see also Mettiäinen et al. 2009.

345 Cole 2006, 97.

346 Arai 1996.

Scheyvens³⁴⁷, who identified empowerment in terms of social, economic, psychological and political change.³⁴⁸ In my earlier research on community-based tourism in Nicaragua, I analysed social and cultural significance of local participation by drawing on Cole's³⁴⁹ and Scheyvens³⁵⁰ approaches on empowerment. In that study I suggested that while external contacts, self-esteem, pride and confidence can have a positive influence on empowerment, a lack of knowledge about tourism, a lack of self-confidence or a lack of skills might lead to disempowerment even though people were seemingly participating in tourism development.³⁵¹ The conceptualization of empowerment has been used especially in research that focus on the issues of gender equality in the context of tourism development.³⁵² For example, Linda W.J. Peeters and Irena Ateljevic³⁵³ have analyzed community development and women's empowerment through three case studies in East Africa, based on which they call for further innovative research in the area of (women's) tourism entrepreneurship.³⁵⁴ In the same vein of studies, Heidi Dahles' and Lou Keune's³⁵⁵, anthology on local participation, explores the questions of *small-scale entrepreneurship* and gender in tourism development in Latin American context.

The discussions on local participation in tourism studies are closely intertwined to the questions of *poverty reduction*. One of the fundamental reasons to focus on the well-being of economically marginalized rural communities is the concern about the inequalities and economic disparities between self and other, rich and poor, urban and rural, North and South.³⁵⁶ During the past fifteen years, another central theme connected with community participation has been the contribution of tourism development to

347 Scheyvens 1999; see also 2002, 2003.

348 Ibid., Telfer 2003, 264; Telfer & Sharpley 2008, 130.

349 Cole 2006.

350 Scheyvens 1999; 2002.

351 Höckert 2011.

352 Miettinen 2007; Hashimoto 2014, 223-5.

353 Ateljevic & Page 2009.

354 See also Anne Marie Van Broek's (2002) *The (Missing) Gender Dimension: A Review of Tourism Literature on Latin America and the Caribbean*.

355 Dahles & Keune 2002.

356 Telfer & Sharpley 2008; Scheyvens 2011; Jänis 2011; Bianchi 2014.

the Millennium Development goals.³⁵⁷ As part of this, there has also been more discussion about the issue of good governance as a means to reach the goals. However, in her recent book *Tourism and Poverty*, Scheyvens³⁵⁸ argues that the interconnections between tourism and multiple dimensions of poverty have remained largely understudied. Scheyvens³⁵⁹ approaches the interconnections between poverty and tourism development from different theoretical perspectives, including that of political economy. Throughout her in-depth analysis, she explores the ways in which neoliberal tourism policies can lead to economic growth without translating into benefits for the poor.³⁶⁰ While doing this, she deconstructs the artificial dichotomy between supposedly responsible forms of tourism and conventional forms of mass tourism; thus, Scheyvens³⁶¹ argues that alternative forms of tourism, such as community-based tourism, should also be subject to the same kind of critical scrutiny as other forms of tourism. Recently a growing number of tourism authors have approached the inequalities and effects of globalization using the *political economy approach*.³⁶² One such research is Julia Jänis³⁶³ case study on the tourism-development nexus in Namibia, in which she utilizes the political economy approach to analyse the interconnections between tourism planning, power relations and natural resources in the context of micro and small tourism enterprises. Based on her analysis, Jänis argues that although support to small-scale and locally owned businesses forms a central part of sustainable tourism development, inequality constrain the implementation of such tourism strategies.

Moreover, Jänis³⁶⁴ research applies the concept of local policy knowledge along with the anthropological concept of *local knowledge*, which has

357 Analysis on the interconnections between Millennium development goals and tourism development can be found in Cesar D'Mello 2008; Jeff Wild, 2008; Jänis 2011; Saarinen, Rogerson & Manwa 2012; Telfer 2014, 69-73.

358 Scheyvens 2011; The same argument has been made by scholars like de Kadt 1979; Viswanath 2008, 43; Carlisle 2010, 69; Kalisch 2010, 90.

359 Ibid.

360 See also Schilcher 2007; Bianchi 2015.

361 Scheyvens 2011, 71.

362 For examples, see Schilcher 2007; Jänis 2011; Bianchi 2014.

363 Ibid.

364 Ibid. 22.

been used simultaneously with such concepts as indigenous knowledge, indigenous knowledge systems, traditional knowledge and rural people's knowledge.³⁶⁵ The issue of local or indigenous knowledge has become a commonly used concept or reference point in the academic discussions on community participation in tourism; for instance, Wood³⁶⁶ argues that 'local people are likely to hold important knowledge necessary for sustainable tourism development.'³⁶⁷ While 'local knowledge' has a somewhat populist connotation within development studies³⁶⁸, in tourism research it seems to have divided researchers' opinions into two groups. Whereas some researchers have called for more careful attention to local knowledges in order to question the Eurocentric ways of knowing tourism³⁶⁹, others consider that the local communities are often lacking of needed knowledge and thus seriously hindered from participating in planning and developing tourism.³⁷⁰ For instance, in her research on community capacity building for tourism, Gianna Moscardo³⁷¹ argues that the local communities' unawareness of tourism markets is often used as justification to exclude local residents and other community stakeholders from involvement in tourism planning. Although local knowledge might be considered an important aspect of tourism development, there seems to exist a consensus that local knowledges rarely include awareness about tourism.³⁷²

It would be ambiguous to squeeze the results of community participation studies into neat categories, as the findings of growing amount of community participation research in tourism are undeniably miscellaneous and messy.³⁷³ There are a number of studies that have drawn attention to the negative influences of participatory tourism development, such as problems

365 The notion of local knowledge has been regularly used in the scholarly discussions on environmental conservation (see for instance Nygren 1999).

366 Wood 2000, 601.

367 The same argument is also made in the studies such Jamal et al. 2003, 154; Telfer 2009; 153; Phommavong 2011, 201; Pritchard et al. 2011, 14; Zapata et al. 2011, 23.

368 Nygren 1999.

369 Ibid.; Sinchler 2007.

370 See, for instance, Moscardo 2008.

371 Moscardo 2006; 2008.

372 For detailed discussion on local tourism awareness, see Saarinen's (2010) research in Namibia.

373 Scheyvens 2011; Dredge et al. 2013, 33-5.

in achieving the goal of benefit delivery, aggravating and creating internal conflicts and jealousies, and promoting unrealistic expectations.³⁷⁴ Yet, Telfer³⁷⁵ has drawn inspiration from the case studies on seemingly successful tourism entrepreneurship in indigenous communities, and Timothy's³⁷⁶ examples include positive examples from the 1990s in particular. However, although Timothy³⁷⁷ pointed out in 2002 that there existed a widespread agreement on how sustainable tourism planning and development must proceed at the grassroots level, it seems like ever since the general tone of among tourism researchers has turned become more sceptical towards the idea of community participation as such.

According to Moscardo³⁷⁸, there have been only few longitudinal studies which would have followed the local planning processes since the very beginning of tourism development. Instead, studies on participatory tourism planning and development often are reactive assessments of failure or success.³⁷⁹ When the critique towards participatory approaches in tourism has been growing, many studies have drawn attention to different limitations for participation; that is, to different reasons why local communities face difficulties in participating in tourism development.³⁸⁰ Cevat Tosun's³⁸¹ research on 'Limits of participation', must be one of the most comprehensive studies that address the variety of limits of local participations in developing countries in particular. Although Tosun sees local participation as highly desirable, he identifies several limits that hinder locals from participating in tourism. He divides these limitations into operational, structural and cultural ones. Some of these include somewhat essentializing representa-

374 Young 1973; Krippendorff 1987; Taylor 1995; Butler & Hinch 1996; Tosun 2000; Swarbrooke 2002; Fagance 2003; Murphy & Murphy 2004; Blackstock 2005; Kontogeorgopoulos 2005; Simpson 2-3.

375 Telfer 2003; see also Ranck 1987 and Long & Wall 1993 in Telfer 2003, 244.

376 Timothy 2002, 154.

377 Ibid. 155 referring to tourism scholars such as Murphy, Simmons, Scheyvens, and Tosun.

378 Moscardo 2008, xi.

379 For an example of a somewhat exceptional longitudinal research within rural tourism development, see Hakkarainen, 2009, forthcoming; Cole 2008; Tucker 2010.

380 Research in this vein includes analysis made by Hall 2003; Dixey 2008; Scheyvens 2011; Goodwin et al. 2013; Weaver 2013.

381 Tosun 2000.

tion about the 'other'. For instance, under the category of cultural limits, Tosun mentions aspects like 'the limited capacity of poor people to handle development effectively', 'apathy' and 'a low level of awareness in the local community'. In Tosun's³⁸² view the lack of tourism culture and knowledge on tourism can be explained, for instance, by '...the cultural remoteness of host communities to tourism-related businesses in developing countries.' Moreover, he suggests that the biggest challenge for the poor in many local tourist destinations in the developing world appears to be mere survival, which occupies all the time and consumes their energy.³⁸³ The lack of local knowledge about tourism also belongs to the long list of limitations on local participation, initially presented by Tosun.

Although Tosun's research highlights important insights on participatory tourism initiatives, his work also contributes to tourism literature where the 'other' becomes represented through the 'other's' limitations. In fact, these kinds of stereotypical, homogenizing representations of the 'other' are something that has been heavily criticized, for instance, in development studies.³⁸⁴ Despite the good and straightforward intentions to promote participatory tourism development, Tosun, amongst others, actively contributes to certain kind of 'worldmaking' and 'othering' through representing the other through academic studies.³⁸⁵ By the concept of worldmaking I refer here to what Hollishead³⁸⁶ describes as collaborative processes that essentialize, naturalize and normalize peoples, places and practices. The notion of worldmaking calls here for critical reflection on the ways in which production of knowledge is involved in constituting the world.³⁸⁷ Hence, the debates on community participation, as Cooke & Kothari's³⁸⁸ suggest

382 Tosun 1998b, 607 in Tosun 2000, 630.

383 Ibid. 625.

384 Eriksson Baaz 2005; Kuokkanen 2007; McEwan 2009; Escobar 2012.

385 For more on the concept of 'worldmaking' in tourism research, see in particular Hollishead 2002, 2004; 2007; Caton 2008, 2013, 2014; Tucker 2009; Belhassen & Caton 2011; Dredge et al. 2013, 34; see also Aitchinson 2001.

386 Hollishead 2007, 167.

387 Ibid. See also Tucker 2009; 2014; Dredge & Hales 2012, 428; Grimwood & Doubleday 2013, 53.

388 Cooke & Kothari 2012.

in their *Tyranny of participation*, could focus more on what kinds of subject positions are created in these discourses.

The focus on limits of participation might also take place at the expense of more open dialogues which could spark awareness about the prejudice and knowledge among the tourism researchers and practitioners themselves.³⁸⁹ The post-positivist studies which ask *whether* community participation can work or *why* community participation fails lack further reflection on whose point of view these questions are being examined from.³⁹⁰ Therefore, the purpose of the last section is to pay a closer attention on the issues of agency in community participation, that is, on the ways in which the means and goals of participation become defined in participatory tourism discussions.

2.3 Hosts and guests in participatory tourism development

Host-guest relations in tourism have been well explored in tourism research since the end of 1970s.³⁹¹ The basic idea behind the idea of *participatory tourism development* is to guarantee that local communities would be able maintain the role of a host in the course of tourism development.³⁹² The last part of this literature review sheds some light on previous research on host-guest relations within participatory tourism development. More specifically, my purpose is to explore the ways in which the encounters between tourism experts and rural communities have been approached in participatory tourism settings.

The majority of case-studies on participatory tourism development situates in rural and peripheral areas. In tourism studies the antecedents of rural tourism have been located in the 17th century images of rural communities as

389 For potentialities within participatory tourism development, see Wearing & McDonald 2002, 202-3.

390 Dredge & Hales 2012.

391 Since Smith's (1977) anthology on *Hosts and Guests*.

392 Singh et al. 2003; Cañada & Gascón 2006; Wall and Mathison 2006.

idyllic, authentic and traditional,³⁹³ which make rural tourism appear almost like a match made in heaven: rural ambience and hospitality combined with a romantic picture of communality. What is more, rural tourism is expected to fit well together with more traditional sources of income, and with the 'agrarian way of life' in general.³⁹⁴ As the initiatives for tourism development often arrive from outside³⁹⁵, it means that rural communities are considered as potential sites for participatory tourism projects most of all by people who come from outside. That is, the first initiative for inviting tourists and tourism often come from the outsiders – from the guests.

NGOs in particular have played an important role in participatory tourism initiatives.³⁹⁶ One of the main principles that underline alternative forms of development, as discussed in the Section 2.1., is the idea of promoting development from below, that is, through grassroots movements, communities and NGOs. In fact, alternative development theory has been presented as the terrain of 'Third System' or citizen politics, which typically takes over following failed development efforts of government (first system) and economic power (second system).³⁹⁷ According to Telfer³⁹⁸, the institutional vehicle for this approach 'lies in the realm of NGO's, charities and dissenting social movements', such as the environmental movement and the women's movement. For instance, Richards and Hall³⁹⁹ argue that a stronger role for the third sector has been seen as a potential solution to promote participation and empowerment in tourism development. According to Telfer⁴⁰⁰, it has been noticed at the global level that unless funds are targeted to assist in community tourism development projects, the potential for community development may be lost amid the pressures of the global economy.

393 Lütjhe 2005; Veijola 2006; George et al 2009, 6-9; Lane 2009; Höckert et al. 2013, 160.

394 Ibid., see also Aho & Ilola 2004; Hakkarainen 2009. For research on tourism workers and entrepreneurs who migrate to potential tourism destinations, see Thulemark, Lundmark & Heldt-Cassell 2014.

395 Mowforth & Munt 1998, 242; Saarinen 2004; Butcher 2007; 2012; George et al. 2009; Zapata et al. 2011; Höckert et al. 2013.

396 See, for instance, Tosun 2005; Butcher 2007; Scheyvens 2011.

397 Nerfin 1977 in Nederween Pieterse 2001, 75; see also Burns 2004.

398 Telfer 2009, 152; see also Preston 1996.

399 Richards & Hall 2006, 303.

400 Telfer 2003, 160.

In previous research, the goals of community participation have been connected to the need to reduce inequalities between different regions, socioeconomic groups, women and men, or ethnic groups.⁴⁰¹ Although the processes and consequences of community participation have sometimes been divided along the line of industrialized and developing countries, a growing number of researchers have pointed out the ambiguity of this dichotomy.⁴⁰² By contrast, tourism scholars Timothy and Tosun⁴⁰³, Hall⁴⁰⁴, Höckert et al.⁴⁰⁵, Jamal and Dredge⁴⁰⁶ have suggested that communities in economically marginalized areas across the globe often face similar challenges in tourism development. For instance, although tourism development means receiving and welcoming different kinds of guests in rural communities, one of the challenges is how to avoid an extensive dependency from external actors.⁴⁰⁷

Tourism researchers, such as Jamal and Getz⁴⁰⁸, Tosun⁴⁰⁹, Jamal and Stronza⁴¹⁰, and Saarinen⁴¹¹, have focused on the importance of networks and different kinds of participation channels in local tourism development. Drawing on collaboration theory, Jamal and Getz's seminal research on community tourism planning, published in 1995, provided a more theoretically oriented approach to recognizing and understanding the interdependencies among multiple stakeholders in tourism destinations. In addition to Jamal and Getz, several researchers have drawn attention to the question of power and decision making between and within community groups in order to gain understanding of how different public and private actors shape the

401 Höckert et al. 2013, 161; see also Jänis 2011, 63-7; 148-9; Jamal & Dredge 2014.

402 See for instance Tosun 2000, 2005.

403 Timothy and Tosun 2003.

404 Hall 2007.

405 Höckert et al. 2013.

406 Jamal & Dredge 2014.

407 See for instance, Zapata et al. 2011.

408 Jamal & Getz 1995.

409 Tosun 2000.

410 Jamal & Stronza 2008.

411 Saarinen 2010.

processes of tourism planning.⁴¹² In his research on the topic, Hall⁴¹³ argues that tourism planners have the task of finding agreement between various stakeholders and interests in tourism development.

Although there is a consensus among tourism scholars that tourism and development brokers play a significant role in participatory tourism projects,⁴¹⁴ the opinions about the responsibilities of these development intermediaries vary greatly. Briedenhann and Ramchander⁴¹⁵ suggest that the assistance should extend beyond merely supplying the funding for a tourism project. Many argue that in addition to mediating financial support to rural communities, development practitioners should provide rural communities technical assistance.⁴¹⁶ In their analysis of brokers' behavior in relation to residents, Fennell and Przeclawski⁴¹⁷ go as far as stating that the brokers' responsibility is not only to inform the local hosts about the culture, customs and behaviors of tourists, but also to '...help inhabitants in developing an attitude of hospitality and tolerance'. Maldonado⁴¹⁸ summarizes that in her view the brokers' role is to support the communities in valuing their social capital and the factors that promote cooperation and collective efficiency. Also Hatton⁴¹⁹ suggest that this kind of promotion of knowledge and use of social capital can prepare the local communities to take advantage of further opportunities.

However, when the strategies and financing for participation come from outside the host communities, it is also questionable what happens when the support ends and the projects are handed on to local coordinators.⁴²⁰ For instance, van der Duim et al.⁴²¹ pinpoint and examine examples of

412 Hall 1994; Jamal & Getz 1995; Joppe 1996; Reed 1997; Telfer 2003, 244; Cole 2006, 95; Jamal & Stronza 2008; Quesada 2014; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

413 Hall 2003, 100.

414 see e.g. Cheong & Miller 2000; Fennell & Przeclawski 2003; van der Duim et al. 2006

415 Briedenhann & Ramchander 2006, 124.

416 For capacity building in tourism, see Wearing & McDonald 2002; Miettinen 2007; Moscardo 2008; Höckert 2009; Jänis 2011; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

417 Fennell and Przeclawski 2003, 47.

418 Maldonado 2005, 14.

419 Hatton 1999, 5.

420 Zapata et al. 2011.

421 Duim et al. 2006, 109-10, Dixie 2009, Zapata et al. 2011.

supposedly community-based tourism initiatives which have significantly weakened after the withdrawal of NGOs or other development agencies. A harmful dependency on guests seems somewhat contradictory, as community participation is often proposed as a way to *reduce* existing forms of dependency from international aid, price fluctuations in agrarian products, or transnational tourism companies.⁴²²

In order to reduce dependency, it has been proposed that brokers or intermediaries should not be in charge of community participation initiatives, but instead work as facilitators and sources of information that can be utilized and transformed into knowledge by the communities themselves.⁴²³ However, one commonly identified problem in community-based tourism projects is that the development brokers or tour operators might enter rural areas without prior full understanding of the local realities or, for instance, the interconnection between tourism and community development.⁴²⁴ Swarbrooke⁴²⁵ has indicated that as community involvement in tourism planning can slow down and add costs to tourism planning, development brokers may often use it can often lead to using faster top-down implemented strategies. In practice, this has led to implementation of participatory projects in what the local communities are not even properly informed about what they are participating in, and what impacts their participation may have.⁴²⁶

In their topical research, Wearing and Wearing⁴²⁷ approach the issue of moral encounters in ecotourism from a feminist postcolonial perspective, which directs attention to the inequalities and intersections of gender, race, and socioeconomic positions in host communities. They offer an alternative development model designed to decolonize and redress the imbalances of power relations in tourism planning. The social governing of the colonized 'other' by ecotourism practices, as Wearing and Wearing put it, should be

422 Cañada & Gascón 2006; Pérez et al. 2010.

423 Wearing & McDonald 2002, 203-204; Miettinen 2007, drawing on Parpat 2002; Hakkarainen 2009a.

424 Wearing & McDonald 2002.

425 Swarbrooke 2002, 128.

426 For examples, see Pleumarom 2002 in Wild 2008, 73; Sammels 2014.

427 Wearing & Wearing 2014.

understood within codes and moral frames alternative to those of dominant neoliberalism. According to the authors, these moral frames could be applied to facilitate compassion and also prompt a sense to act on behalf of the oppressed 'other as host'. Moreover, they underline the importance of creating awareness of the role of tourist subjectivities in the perpetuation of particular relations of power.⁴²⁸

Similarly, based on his analysis of international development cooperation in tourism development, Palomo Pérez⁴²⁹ questions the common but incorrect image about the linkage of development aid and responsible and sustainable tourism development. In fact, while a decade ago many researchers were still encouraging NGOs and international aid organizations to take a more active role in addressing the different roadblocks for community participation in tourism⁴³⁰, today an increasing number of tourism scholars view the active role of NGOs more as a roadblock and a problem per se.⁴³¹

The sharpest critique towards the community projects implemented by NGOs and aid agencies has been presented by tourism scholars such as Butcher and Goodwin.⁴³² In his critical analysis on ecotourism, NGOs and development, Butcher⁴³³ argues that although community participation is often associated with a progressive democratic approach, communities are actually invited to participate only in the implementation of ecotourism projects, rather than in shaping the development agenda behind them. According to Butcher⁴³⁴, 'criticism of grand development scheme at a national level and the privileging of local development as a progressive alternative, are both key aspects of the neo-populist outlook that informs ecotourism integrated conservation and development projects'. In his extensive critique of the participatory 'orthodox' in tourism studies, Butcher⁴³⁵ laments that even the comprehensive critical studies tend to focus on *operationalizing*

428 Ibid. 127.

429 Pérez 2003, 6.

430 Telfer 2003, 160; Burns 2004; Cañada & Gascón 2007b, 85-91.

431 Butcher 2007; Scheyvens 2011; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

432 Ibid.; See for instance Goodwin 2011; Goodwin et al. 2014; see also Dixey 2008.

433 Butcher 2007.

434 Ibid. 62.

435 Ibid. 61.

the concept of community participation rather than on the concepts itself.

Butcher argues⁴³⁶, similarly to Wearing and Wearing⁴³⁷ that the studies on local participation have been misleadingly focused only on inclusion *inside* the local communities and not addressed the power relations beyond the community level. In fact, it seems like many tourism scholars might actually agree with Butcher's⁴³⁸ harsh criticism of the paradoxes within the participatory tourism paradigm. By this I refer to Butcher's valid critique on the misuse of participatory rhetoric, for instance, for environmental conservation purposes. Simultaneously, in my view, Butcher's writings have contributed to a somewhat unfruitful 'either-or' debate on *whether* or *not* local communities should be included in tourism. This debate keeps constructing an illusion of local participation as something decided and controlled by outsiders – as if participation and inclusion were something that could be initiated or stopped by tourism experts.

I was delighted to notice how the unproductiveness of this contemporary participatory debate was addressed in Tej Vir Singh's⁴³⁹ anthology *Critical Debates in Tourism*. In one of the chapters of the book, tourism researcher Shalini Singh engages in a direct debate with Butcher's critique on the 'mantra of community participation'.⁴⁴⁰ For me Singh's responses to Butcher capture and clarify the roadblocks that exist, not in participatory practices, in the academic discussions on participatory development. While Singh acknowledges the relevance of Butcher's critique against instrumentality in community participation projects, she faults Butcher's outlook for its reductionism – for its unwillingness to look for alternatives.⁴⁴¹ Singh underlines how, in her view, Butcher denies community participation as an extension of the basic human instinct to interact and to shape one's fate.⁴⁴²

436 Butcher 2012, 103.

437 Wearing & Wearing 2014.

438 See for instance Butcher et al. 2012, 118; Dixey 2008.

439 Singh T. 2012.

440 Very similar kind of discussion takes place between Jim Butcher and Mick Smith in John Tribes' (2009) edited volume *Philosophical issues in Tourism*. Smith's critique towards Butcher's reductionism is similar to the criticism that Smith directs against tourism studies in general.

441 Butcher et al. 2012, 118.

442 Ibid.

To conclude their debate, Butcher and Singh, accompanied by Weaver Weaver⁴⁴³ summarize their recommendations for future research on community participation:

Any assessments of community participation rests on assumptions, and these should be explicitly stated. Otherwise we have ideology masquerading as technique. Equally it is legitimate to assess community participation as a technique, but perhaps not to then make grand claims of empowerment and progress on that basis. This would constitute technique masquerading as ideology. Both are to be avoided in the evolving debates on community participation.

In fact, despite the perceptions of saturation in community participation research, there has been only little reflection about the value premises that shape our opinions of what might be *ethical, sustainable, or participatory*. For me one of the consequences of the extensive focus on methodological packages and techniques is that the conceptualization of community participation has lost its connections to the previous theories on community development and participation; and not least, participation has lost its philosophical meanings.⁴⁴⁴ Hence, my study wishes to join the previous research in tourism which calls for exploring the potentialities of participation as an essential part of humanity.⁴⁴⁵ I agree with Singh⁴⁴⁶, who argues that community participation should not be mistaken as the goal within the big picture of globalization. Instead, participation could be seen as a social and dynamic landscape of evolving human values.⁴⁴⁷ Hence, in Singh's⁴⁴⁸ view, the attempts to define, interpret, model and encourage community participation in the present realities of the globalized world could well be its antithesis. She calls for new perspectives on community participation

443 Ibid. 118-9.

444 Leal 2010, 89; see also Jamal & Stronza 2008; Dredge et al. 2013.

445 Singh 2012; see also Caton 2012; Veijola et al. 2014.

446 Singh 2012, 117.

447 Ibid., 117.

448 Singh S. 2012, 117.

and for addressing the different kinds of valued elements and dynamics that form the ‘lifblood of a community’.

Engaging in these discussions require consideration about possibilities of meaningful ways of going *without* engaging actively in tourism activities. In other words, it means accepting that tourism is not always perceived as an activity that adds on the general well-being of local communities. Interestingly, the possibility of choosing *not* to participate in tourism is rarely discussed in the academic debates on local participation in tourism. Or as Butcher⁴⁴⁹ puts it: it is normally already decided that there will be tourism, which allows people to decide whether or not to participate in tourism development. While the participatory tourism literature takes implicitly for granted the communities’ interest to participate, Schilcher⁴⁵⁰, Jamal and Dredge⁴⁵¹ are among the few authors who have brought up the question whether people can choose *not* to participate in tourism development.

Moving then towards the theoretical framework of this study, I wish to highlight that I consider various analytical strands relevant for my own research on participatory tourism development. These different strands became intertwined by the observation that tourism research has, at least temporarily, failed to address and disrupt the subject-object divisions within the idea of participation.⁴⁵² For instance, in her recent analysis Tucker⁴⁵³ points to the need for moving away from, ‘assumptions of fixed cultural positions in tourism encounters, and towards focusing on the fluidity and mobility of positions and relation between so-called ‘tourists’ and ‘toured’. In my view this paradigm shift is very important as it places the focus on the contradictions and ambiguities of different tourism encounters. As Tucker⁴⁵⁴ argues, drawing on Pedwell⁴⁵⁵, reliance on dichotomous postcolonial subject positions is problematically simplistic.

449 Butcher 2007; 2012, 104.

450 Schilcher 2007, 59.

451 Jamal & Stronza 2009; George et al. 2009; Jamal & Dredge 2014, 195-7.

452 For the discussions on subject-object positions in community participation in tourism development, see for instance Saarinen 2010; Zapata et al. 2011.

453 Tucker 2014, 199.

454 Ibid. 201.

455 Pedwell 2013, 22.

In sum, the review of the previous research on participatory tourism development raises the question whether local communities have actually ended up playing the role of guests even in participatory tourism debates. My study joins to discussions which question the goal-driven idea of participation and call for new spaces for more mobile and hybrid subject positions.⁴⁵⁶ Saying this means also deconstructing the assumed roles of hosts and guests, teachers and learners, in participatory tourism development.⁴⁵⁷

456 Keen & Tucker 2012, 97; Tucker 2014.

457 For the notion of post-host-guest-society, see Veijola & Jokinen 2012.

3 HOSPITALITY AS OPENNESS TOWARDS THE OTHER

The ambition of this theory chapter is to explore how the notion of hospitality can be used as an alternative way to approach the idea of participation in the field of tourism development. This framework challenges the possibility of treating hospitality or participation as projects of a spontaneous, individual subject. Rather, the notions of hospitality and participation both call for openness towards the other.

Development scholar Maria Eriksson Baaz⁴⁵⁸ analyses participatory paradigms within development studies by drawing on Spivak's call for self-reflectivity in encounters with the subaltern. In her analysis, Eriksson Baaz demonstrates the ways in which the principles of participation and partnership continue to be attached to the paternalistic idea of self helping the other.⁴⁵⁹ Her study offers an example which demonstrates the difficulty of disrupting those settings where the rules and responsibilities of participating are defined by development officials.⁴⁶⁰ What this chapter sets out to examine is how the critique on development encounters might correspond with the critique that Levinas and Derrida direct towards Western thought on subjectivity and hospitality. Firstly, these authors on ethical subjectivities lament the ways in which Western philosophy and the Western culture of hospitality have focused on defining conditions and limits.⁴⁶¹ Secondly, in Derrida's view, this idea of hospitality has concerned itself with the issue of *invitation* in lieu of *visitation*. Derrida's thoughts have been rephrased

458 Eriksson Baaz 2005.

459 See also Seppälä, 2013.

460 Eriksson Baaz (2005, 6-7) argues that calling the other as a 'partner', does not make the development encounters less paternalizing; and see also Escobar 2012; Li 2007.

461 Levinas 1969, 20-6; Derrida AEL 1999, 3-5.

by Laachir⁴⁶² as follows: ‘you invite someone to your country, to your house and you set the rules for that invitation’. According to Derrida⁴⁶³, this type of hospitality reasserts the mastery of the host. Hence, this chapter suggests that – similarly to self- and ego-centred approaches on hospitality – local participation in tourism is also told through stories where ‘the self’ decides to invite the ‘other’ to participate. By doing this, the active and supposedly responsible self continues to control and set the rules of participation – to reassert the mastery of the host.⁴⁶⁴ This chapter follows hospitality as an overarching theme for approaching different ways of welcoming, encountering and being for the ‘other’.

The structure of this chapter is the following: before moving in detail into Levinas’ and Derrida’s discussions on hospitality, the first section takes a look at different approaches and understandings of hospitality in tourism research in particular. By doing this, I wish to describe Levinas’ and Derrida’s conceptualization of hospitality in the context of the wider field of hospitality studies. I begin from the historical meanings of the concept and then present Kant’s well-known idea of cosmopolitan hospitality.⁴⁶⁵ From there I move the focus to the development of the tourism and hospitality industries and the ways in which they are expected to serve the needs of international visitors. I point out that the dominance of managerial studies in the field of hospitality has reduced the discussions of ethics to concerns of how to make the hospitality business more responsible.⁴⁶⁶ The section concludes with the argument that tourism studies have drawn surprisingly little attention to the more general connections between hospitality and ethics.

The second section presents Derrida’s idea of the ‘double law of hospitality’, which draws a distinction between the idea of *laws and conditions of hospitality* and the idea of *ethics as hospitality*. In my view Derrida’s work helps to understand the possible limitations of contemporary ideas of ethics and hospitality, which are based for the most part on the laws and condi-

462 See Laachir 2008, 178.

463 Derrida AEL 1999, 15-6.

464 Ibid.; see also Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 5; Kuokkanen 2007, 138.

465 Kant 1975/1996

466 For more on this argument, see Smith, M. 2009a.

tions embraced by Kant, for instance. The section argues that Derrida's interpretation of Levinas' thinking on ethics can offer an alternative way of understanding ethics in relations to the other. In the third section, I delve more deeply into the Levinasian notion of ethics, which always begin from the other. Levinas' conception of ethical subjectivity as receptivity can be seen as a radical alternative to the Western idea of the individual, isolated subject, which makes it meaningful to examine the influence of Levinas' ideas on later criticism of the colonial legacy. The fourth section discusses the issue of privilege in postcolonial relations. Drawing especially on Spivak's ideas regarding privilege and epistemic violence, I argue that those with a relatively privileged position tend to take it for granted that they are welcome to visit, help and study others. This leads to a situation where even emancipatory intentions to help, or 'give a voice' to, the other, maintain overbearing subject positions between self and the other. The chapter suggests how Levinas' and Derrida's notions of hospitality and welcoming can help one to become aware of one's privileged position in relation to the other, and then – as Spivak⁴⁶⁷ puts it – to learn to unlearn one's privilege as loss. The fifth and last section summarizes the idea of hospitable encounters presented in the chapter. It proposes that the notion of hospitality calls for making space for the other in the encounters between self and other. With reference to the idea of a *home*, the chapter describes how hospitality – in different levels of abstraction – can help to understand how we relate to others and to ourselves.⁴⁶⁸

3.1 Realms of hospitality

This section offers an overview of various domains of hospitality. In engaging with Levinas' and Derrida's writings on hospitality in the course of my research, I have observed that in practice the issue of hospitality is commonly treated as a question of aesthetics, rather than a question of ethics. For

467 Spivak 1990, 20; See also Kapoor 2004, McEwan 2009, 68-9.

468 Levinas T&I 1969, 155-65, 170; Derrida AEL 1999, 41-3; see also Baker 2013, 4.

instance, when taking a walk around the suburbs in my current hometown in Sweden, I have noticed that many families have stylish ‘Welcome’ signs hanging on their front doors. Instead of expecting that the families would welcome any passers-by into their homes, I have considered that these signs appear more as decorative details. I believe that the welcome signs are often hung on the doors to create a cosy atmosphere without further consideration of the people who are actually welcomed and allowed to enter these homes. In fact, I assume that some people might even have quite limited tolerance of surprise guests who interrupt the families’ planned routines or time set aside for relaxation. Moreover, when a guest arrives without notice, a host is left without a chance to prepare her or his hospitality by cleaning the house, fixing something to eat or at least dressing properly for visitors.⁴⁶⁹

In the conventional formulation of hospitality, the guest is the traveller who receives hospitality in the home of the host. However, the home can mean different spaces, different forms of homes where a space is made for the guest to arrive.⁴⁷⁰ While there is no clear definition, or unanimous theoretical framework of hospitality⁴⁷¹, hospitality is generally used as a description of self’s relation to the other. In contrast to contemporary connotations of the concept, the historical meaning of hospitality directed thoughts towards encounters between strangers.⁴⁷² As Germann Molz and Gibson⁴⁷³ phrase it, hospitality is a phenomenon that, even where it fails, evokes an ancient and persistent question: How should we welcome the stranger, the sojourner, the traveller, the other?

Hospitality has been practiced for thousands of years and is rooted in the survival of the human ‘species’.⁴⁷⁴ Accounts of hospitality often hark back to the antecedents of encounters in the glorious days of the Greeks,

469 On cleaning one’s place for guests to arrive, see Veijola et al. 2014, x.

470 Gotman, 2001, 2; Bell 2009, 22.

471 Lynch et al. 2011, 5; Veijola et al. 2014.

472 Lashley 2000, 6; O’Gorman 2007. While saying this, it is important to notice the ways in which people’s attitudes towards refugees, the strangers were changing in Europe during the fall 2015. Although refugees have faced racism and closed borders, there also occurred a strong wave of welcoming and solidarity among people.

473 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 1.

474 Alessandro Netto 2009, 57; O’Gorman 2010.

Romans or Enlightenment.⁴⁷⁵ In these accounts hospitality entails a sacred obligation not only to accommodate the guest, but to protect the stranger who arrives at the door.⁴⁷⁶ In medieval times, hospitality was understood not only as accommodating foreigners and travellers for free, but also as showing compassion for the other in monasteries, guesthouses and hospitals. Later on, hospitality acquired new meanings, among these the mutual obligation to protect, receive, accommodate and feed each other – and to receive others, especially the poor, without compensation.⁴⁷⁷

Helmuth Berking⁴⁷⁸ presents hospitality as one of the most significant social inventions in the history of humankind. He uses the concept of the ‘guest situation’ to describe a means of tempering the potentially life-threatening arrival of a stranger into a ritual that upholds and celebrates the local way of life. This ritualistic welcome, Berking⁴⁷⁹ continues, gave the host the power to define the guest situation. Hence, hospitality changed the threat connected with the arrival of a stranger to its opposite to an opportunity. Instead of seeing receiving a stranger as a threat, hospitality gave the receiving community an opportunity to present the best sides of their homes to the honoured guest.⁴⁸⁰

Tracing the trajectory of ‘hospitality’, O’Gorman⁴⁸¹ and Lynch et al.⁴⁸² describe the ways in which different scholars have found a wide range of connotations for the term through Middle English, Old Norse, Greek and Latin. These include *sacrifice*, *army*, *power*, *obligation*, *reciprocity* and *protection*.⁴⁸³ Especially interesting in etymological perspective is how *guest* and *host* share the same root meaning of ‘stranger’, ‘enemy’.⁴⁸⁴ Consequently, *hôte*, *hospis* and *hostis* can be combined in different ways in order to refer to hospitality and

475 Still 2006 in Lynch et al. 2011, 4; O’Gorman 2007; Baker 2013, 2.

476 Lynch 2011, 4; O’Gorman 2010; Nousiainen 2015, 14.

477 Gotman 2001, 13 in Järvinen-Tassopoulos 2011, 309.

478 Berking 1999, 82; See also Veijola et al. 2014, 5.

479 Ibid., 92.

480 See Veijola et al. 2013, 19; Veijola et al. 2014.

481 See O’Gorman (2010) *The Origins of Hospitality and Tourism*.

482 Lynch, et al. 2011.

483 Ibid. 5; Benveniste 1973; O’Gorman 2007.

484 Benveniste 1973.

hostility: to a guest, a host, a hostile party and a friend.⁴⁸⁵ Thus, although the concept of *hospitalitas* might have originally referred to charity and receptivity, it also refers to a possible hostility amongst hosts and guests.⁴⁸⁶

Kant's (1996 [1975]) *Perpetual Peace* argues that on a geographically restricted planet our natural destiny and necessity is to come into contact with other people and to live in each other's company. He approaches this 'natural law' of living together on earth as a 'cosmopolitan right' to move from place to another and encounter each other.⁴⁸⁷ Thus, Kant's universal idea of hospitality guarantees the right to mobility around the globe and to be received without hostility.⁴⁸⁸ In his view, it is only through the principle of cosmopolitan hospitality that humanity can gradually come closer to establishing world citizenship and thus *perpetual peace*.⁴⁸⁹ At the same time, Kant maintains that the traveller should not use this mobility as a means of abuse, exploitation or oppression. Later he criticizes the commercial states of Europe for advancing their economic wealth through inhospitable actions and exploitation of colonized regions. However, although Kant points out the Western tendency to abuse the hospitality of 'virgin territories', his idea of cosmopolitanism neglects the question of how peace may be decided differently between those who have wealth and influence and those who do not. The idea of cosmopolitan hospitality is in fact based on the power of wealth, which is exclusive to certain powerful states and subjects.⁴⁹⁰

It is obvious that Kant's ideas on cosmopolitanism and 'being the citizen in the world', written more than two hundred years ago, have framed the contemporary debates of international encounters and hospitality between people and nations⁴⁹¹. Ever since the 1800s, hospitality has been increasingly shaped by laws, customs and commercialization, and thus come to

485 Salmi & Linkomies 1964 in Järvinen-Tassopoulos 2011, 311; Levinas O&B1998, 111-12; Derrida AEL 1999, 55-7; O'Gorman 2010, 12-5; Still 2010, 6; Nykänen & Veijola 2013, 93.

486 Salmi & Linkomies 1964 in Järvinen-Tassopoulos 2011, 309-11

487 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 4; Laachir 2007, 179; Baker 2013.

488 Ibid.; see also Wadron 2006 in Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007, 4.

489 Kant 1996; see also Laachir 2007, 179.

490 Ibid.; see also Rosello 2001; Derrida & Rottenberg 2002, 142-3; Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Laachir 2007, 179; Nykänen & Veijola 2013, 92; Baker 2013.

491 Laachir 2007, 179; Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 4.

mean more than simply private relations between people.⁴⁹² What is more, it seems like the ideal and romantic image of the tourism industry – and even more of the ‘ideal tourist’ – can be traced to Kant’s notions of cosmopolitan mobility and hospitality. In fact, cosmopolitanism can be traced back to the founding father of the Cynic movement in Ancient Greece, Diogenes of Sinope (c. 412 B.C.). Asked where he came from, Diogenes supposedly answered: ‘I am a citizen of the world’ (kosmopolitês). Ulf Hannerz⁴⁹³ connects the notion of cosmopolitans to the small elite of the world’s population who are financially well-off, socially and geographically mobile and culturally literate. He argues that cosmopolitanism is above all an orientation: ‘a willingness to engage with the other’.⁴⁹⁴ As a result, the cosmopolitan vision is contradicted by the celebration of openness toward divergent cultural experiences and an ability to master the signs of cultural difference and authenticity.⁴⁹⁵

While the image of the ‘citizens of the world’ originally described anthropologists, explorers and missionaries, the group of select elite has since become substantially larger.⁴⁹⁶ In fact, the number of tourists – citizens of the world – and their interests are expected to continue to expand.⁴⁹⁷ Or, as Jokinen and Veijola⁴⁹⁸ describe it, the explorers have become sex-tourists, the *flâneurs* have become paparazzis, and today’s au-pairs are like the nomads of the past. Ever since the rapid growth of mass tourism in the 1970s, the tourism sector has turned its attention towards managing hospitality in hotels and restaurants. Especially tourists with less interest in local cultures in tourism destinations – a type of tourists who Stanley C. Plog⁴⁹⁹ calls *psychocentric* – have most likely been pleased about the new opportunities to dwell in commercialized and managed forms of ‘hospitality culture’.

492 O’Gorman 2010.

493 Hannerz 1990 in Dicks 2003, 195.

494 Hannerz, 1996, 103 in Eriksson-Baaz 2005, 50

495 Ibid.; Dicks 2003, 57-9; Vrsti 2013, 130; Most importantly, this kind mobility does not automatically promote the ideals of inclusive morality.

496 See for instance, Urry 1990; Sharpley & Telfer 2014, xiv-xv.

497 Sharpley & Telfer 2014, xiv-xvi.

498 Jokinen & Veijola 1; Veijola 1997, 38

499 Plog, 1991.

Before the label *hospitality* was widely adopted in the academic journals, curricula and strategies of tourism, the business sector was known as *Hotel and Catering*.⁵⁰⁰ However, this has changed, especially in the English-speaking world, where hospitality – as an imported and commercialized idea – forms the core of and metaphor for *tourism*.⁵⁰¹ Or perhaps more precisely, hospitality can be seen as the *brand* of tourism, a label for selling products and services, as sociologist Jarno Valkonen once suggested in our discussion on the topic.⁵⁰² Today, the tourism industries are based on commercial hospitality, commercial accommodation, transportation, restaurant services and different kinds of programmes and experiences⁵⁰³; and even on commercial friendships, as as described in the context of homestay forms of tourism.⁵⁰⁴ It is uncertain whether hospitality loses its value when commercialized, or whether commercialized hospitality could or should embrace the idea of reciprocal forms of caring.⁵⁰⁵ While studying or managing hospitality means learning the rules of performing in the settings of commercial hospitality, there are those who claim that in fact mass tourism is not about hospitality at all.⁵⁰⁶

Mass tourism seems to establish fixed roles between those who receive visitors in their homes (read: hotels) and those who visit the homes of the others. However, there are many who claim that the question of hosting and guesting is far from an uncomplicated one, particularly taking into account the unequal power relations where the other serves the self.⁵⁰⁷ The issue of tourism as work has recently been discussed in a growing strand of literature. The question of tourism work in postcolonial settings has been explored in particular detail in Gmelch's⁵⁰⁸ book *Behind the Smile*, which

500 Veijola et al. 2013, 18.

501 Lynch et al. 2011, 6.

502 Valkonen (no date).

503 Veijola et al. 2013, 19.

504 Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2012; see also Veijola's & Valtonen's (2007) discussion on homes which become servicescapes.

505 See Nousiainen 2015.

506 Aramberri 2001 in Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 7.

507 See Veijola & Jokinen 2008; Bell 2009; Salazar 2010, Veijola 2010; Jokinen & Veijola 2012.

508 Gmelch 2003.

takes the viewpoint of tourism workers in the Caribbean Islands. Veijola⁵⁰⁹, in her article *Gender as Work in the Tourism Industry*, proposes that the discussions of tourism as work offer a ‘new horizon of thought for tourism research by challenging the bipolarized knowledge interests of critical and industry-driven approaches’. In her view, research that approaches tourism from the workers’ viewpoint provides a fruitful meeting place for these two paradigms in tourism research.⁵¹⁰

It appears to be the fine line between commercial hospitality, on the one hand, and the idea of reciprocal and altruistic hospitality, on the other, that continues to fascinate not only tourists, but also tourism researchers and developers.⁵¹¹ Tourists’ travel stories are often coloured by descriptions of hospitable locals who help and served their guests so well, or of rude hosts who do not take care of paying customers. What is more, many of us are keen to find authentic, non-touristic places where they could be received as non-tourists. Tourism scholars are simultaneously interested and highly sceptical about the narratives and experiences of the authentic.⁵¹² Without wanting to sound rude, I find it worth pointing out that merely by entering a supposedly ‘non-touristic place’, a tourist transforms that place into a ‘touristic one’.

In Conrad Lashley’s⁵¹³ model, hospitality is conceptualized in terms of three domains: the social and cultural, the private and domestic, and the commercial. However, while other hospitality scholars have also sought to draw distinctions between different areas of hospitality, Lashley⁵¹⁴ points out that the domains presented are actually very much interwoven, each informing the other. In general, tourism literature seems to happily mix

509 Veijola 2010, 109.

510 Ibid., 110; In the context of Finnish Lapland, tourism and hospitality as work have been researched also in work by Veijola and Valtonen (2007), Valkonen and Veijola eds. (2008), Jokinen & Veijola (2008, 2012), Maria Hakkarainen (2009), Rantala (2011a) and Nousiainen (2015), all of whom focus on the manifold positions of tourism workers in the production of ‘hospitable’ experiences.

511 For analysis of the porous limits between commercial and private forms of hospitality, see Lynch et al 2007; Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2012; Eksell 2013; Nousiainen 2015.

512 MacCannell, 1976; Urry 1990, 7-11; Dicks 2003, 30-2; Edensor 2009; Lütjhe 2005.

513 Tilalle Lashley 2000, 5-16.

514 Ibid.

these different forms of hospitality, which makes it questionable whether it is possible or meaningful to treat these dimensions separately. A good example of this 'mix' is the sector of commercial homes and commercial friendships, discussed in the work of Hultman and Andersson Cederholm.⁵¹⁵ Such settings bring together the expectations of different domains of hospitality⁵¹⁶ and enrich our understandings of hospitality.⁵¹⁷

Lynch et al.⁵¹⁸ encourage us researchers to note that hospitality is approached in very different ways, for instance, in the social sciences and in managerial studies. At present, a considerable segment of the tourism literature has adopted the managerial approach, that is, an approach where hospitality is perceived as something that can be managed, learned, worked with and above all charged for.⁵¹⁹ A good example of this can be found in John Tribe's edited volume *Philosophical issues in Tourism*, published in 2009. In this anthology, tourism scholar Alessandro Panosso Netto⁵²⁰ defines the principle of hospitality as 'a social-cultural phenomenon that includes the food, drink and accommodation offered to the guest'. While acknowledging that hospitality is related to an act that has been practiced for thousands of years, he divides hospitality into three areas: domestic, commercial and public. However, the ontological and transcendental dimensions of hospitality, which I was hoping to find in the *philosophical* discussions in tourism, are utterly lacking in Panosso Netto's article.⁵²¹

The managerial and instrumental approach to hospitality can be seen as rather narrow and limiting. Above all, it makes a pessimistic prognosis about the search for ethics or, shall we say, corporate social responsibility in the hospitality industries. This mind-set strengthens an idea whereby the

515 Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2010; Lynch et al. 2007.

516 The hosts are the attractions which make the encounters intimate – while still including the commercial aspect.

517 Bell 2009, 22; see also O'Gorman 2010; Nousiainen 2015.

518 Lynch et al. 2011, 4. For example of a comprehensive research within *Hospitality and service management*, see Eksell 2013.

519 Nousiainen 2015.

520 Panosso Netto 2009, 57.

521 See also Elizabeth Telfer's (2000) article on 'The Philosophy of Hospitableness'. For critique of somewhat limited approaches on hospitality in contemporary studies in tourism, see also Huijbens and Benediktsson 2013, 199.

interest in receiving strangers, and treating them with respect, is understood in utilitarian terms, that is, in terms of the outcome and results of doing so. Until recently the wider discussions of ethics have taken place only in the ‘margins’ of tourism and hospitality discussions.⁵²² For instance, Sohail Inayatullah⁵²³ and Tracy Berno⁵²⁴ have approached tourism as something which is not based on ‘hedonistic leisure activity’, but on the roles, values and spirituality behind hospitality. Fortunately, the recent ethical turn in tourism has stimulated scholars’ interest in and enhanced their possibilities of exploring ethical dimensions in the hospitality–tourism nexus.⁵²⁵

In sum, the notion of hospitality between hosts and guests can lead tourism researchers and scholars from other fields of studies in many different directions. Lynch et al.⁵²⁶ point out that while hospitality industries have hijacked the concept *per se*, tourism studies have become more inhospitable towards the interdisciplinary study of hospitality. One example of this has been the reluctance of tourism researchers to tackle the issues of exclusion and inequality in, paradoxically, an industry based on welcoming and hospitality.⁵²⁷ One of the exceptions is the study by Darlene MacNaughton⁵²⁸ called ‘the Hosts as uninvited guests’, which highlights the ambiguity of the current host-guest dichotomy in tourism studies; that is, there exists a need to ask how the roles of hosts and guests become shaped in tourism encounters. In saying this, I see that it is time to examine the influence of Derrida’s ‘double law of hospitality’ on the contemporary discussions of ethics in a mobile world.⁵²⁹

522 Smith, M. 2009b, 624–625; see also Fennell 2008.

523 Inayatullah 1995.

524 Berno 1999.

525 Fennell 2008, Bell 2009, 19–20; Caton, 2012; García-Rosell 2013; Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Veijola et al. 2014.

526 Lynch et al. 2011, 3.

527 see Cole & Morgan 2010; Mowforth et al. 2008.

528 MacNaughton 2006.

529 I want to highlight that my study has drawn inspiration especially from Germann Molz’s and Gibson’s (2007) thought of ‘Mobilizing Hospitality’.

3.2 Double law of hospitality

The recent theoretical mobilization of hospitality towards ethics of social relations has primarily drawn on Derrida's writings on hospitality.⁵³⁰ In his work, Derrida focuses on the limitations of Kant's definition of 'law of universal hospitality', which guarantees the rights and responsibilities associated with global mobility. While acknowledging the importance of the Kantian right to travel and to be received in other lands, especially in the context of migration, asylum and citizenship, Derrida⁵³¹ criticizes Kant's way of defining hospitality in terms of juridical and political conditions. For Derrida, hospitality in Kant's *Perpetual Peace* means being responsible before the law, and being subject to the law. Derrida⁵³² uses the example of interrogating the stranger at the moment of arrival by asking for the newcomer's name. By way of contrast, he asks whether hospitality could be *given* to the other before the other has been identified by family name or legal status.⁵³³

As brought up briefly in the introduction (1.3.), Derrida⁵³⁴, drawing especially on Levinas' discussions on ethics, points out that Kant's formulation of hospitality excludes unconditional and absolute hospitality, that is, the *ethics of hospitality*. According to Derrida, it is not possible that particular laws or politics would be *deduced* from ethical discourse on hospitality. However, Derrida does not describe the *laws of hospitality* and *ethics of hospitality* as opposites. Instead, in his view, it is between these two conceptions of hospitality that responsibilities must be taken.⁵³⁵ Derrida refers to this situation as the 'double law of hospitality' – negotiating and calculating the risks of welcoming while not closing the door to the unexpected.⁵³⁶ Hence,

530 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 4; Still 2010; Baker, 2013.

531 Derrida AEL 1999, 86-91.

532 Derrida 2000, 27, 29.

533 Ibid.; AEL 1999, 87; see also Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 4.

534 Ibid.; AEL 1999, 19-20; 48-51.

535 AEL 1999, 20-1.

536 Ibid., 2002, 2-14; Derrida 2005, 6; in his work, Derrida is especially interested and concerned about the people who are 'without a home', see e.g. AEL 1999, 19-20, 26; 2000, 75-81; Raffoul 2002, 213. The questions of undedicability and inescapability of these negotiations are also discussed in the work of Baker 2010; 2011.

what Levinas brings into the discussion of hospitality is the idea of ethics as opening the door to the Other, to exteriority, to the idea of infinity that can come to us through that door.⁵³⁷

While tourism scholars have recently engaged more with Derrida's discussions of hospitality⁵³⁸, Derrida tried to make it clear that it is in fact Levinas whose thought as a whole should be approached from the perspective of hospitality.⁵³⁹ Although Levinas does not use the concept with any frequency, Derrida perceives that it is Levinas' *Totality and Infinity* in particular that invites us to think what is called hospitality.⁵⁴⁰ Derrida⁵⁴¹ approaches and explores this motif in his *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*. In addition to conveying Levinasian thinking on ethical subjectivity, the two essays in the work – *Adieu* and *The Word of Welcome* – underpin Derrida's own conceptual work and moral claims of cosmopolitanism and the deconstruction of borders.⁵⁴²

Derrida continues these discussions later in *Of Hospitality*⁵⁴³, *On Cosmopolitanism*⁵⁴⁴, *Negotiations*⁵⁴⁵ and in *The Principle of Hospitality*⁵⁴⁶ where he also underlines the idea that 'there is no culture or social bond without a principle of hospitality'. Derrida⁵⁴⁷ describes hospitality as a condition of humanity:

Hospitality is culture itself and not simply one ethic amongst others. Insofar as it has to do with the *ethos*, that is, the residence, one's home, the familiar place of dwelling, inasmuch as it is a manner of being there, the manner in which we relate to ourselves and to other, to others as our own or as far as foreigners, *ethics is hospitality*; ethics is so thoroughly coextensive with the experience of hospitality.

537 Derrida AEL 1999, 26.

538 See O'Gorman 2010; Lynch et al. 2011; Nykänen & Veijola 2013.

539 Derrida AEL 1999, 21, 85; Raffoul, 2002, 212.

540 Ibid. AEL 1999, 16; 21–6.

541 Ibid.

542 Drabinski 2013, 188; see Derrida (1967/1978) *Writing and Metaphysics*.

543 Derrida 2000; First published in 1997, translated to English in 2000. The book is co-authored by Anne Dufourmantelle who 'invites Jacques Derrida to Respond'.

544 Derrida 2001, First published in French in 1997, translated into English in 2001.

545 Derrida & Rottenberg 2002.

546 Derrida 2005, 6.

547 Derrida 2001, 16–17; see also Still 2010, 7.

It is clear that Levinas' thinking on totality and infinity has helped and guided Derrida to formulate his critique of Kant's definition of laws and conditions of hospitality (totality) and to point out the absence of unconditionally open welcoming (infinity). Although Levinas has not always been acknowledged in the contemporary discussions of ethics, a growing number of scholars have drawn attention to the ways in which his view of ethics has been transforming the phenomenological tradition and contributed significantly to the ethical turn of continental philosophy.⁵⁴⁸ Maurice Blanchot⁵⁴⁹ describes the importance of Levinas' thought by saying:

...we are called upon to become responsible for what philosophy essentially is, by welcoming, in all the radiance and infinite exigency proper to it, the idea of the Other, that is to say, the relation with *autrui*. It is though there were here a new departure in philosophy and a leap that it, and we ourselves, were urged to accomplish.

Levinas⁵⁵⁰ built his thought on the modern phenomenological movement with special attention to various forms of human experiences. As Levinas' commentators point out, development of his work would have been impossible without his knowledge of phenomenological thinkers, such as Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty.⁵⁵¹ However, Levinas found these thinkers' theories to be one-sidedly egocentric and reductive, meaning that they did not do justice to the 'other'.⁵⁵² According to Derrida⁵⁵³, Levinas slowly bent 'the axis, trajectory, and even the order of phenomenology or ontology'. Levinas directed his critique particularly towards Heidegger's⁵⁵⁴

548 Derrida AEL 1999, 8-12, 26; For authors who have emphasized the importance of Levinasian ethics, see, for instance, Cohen R.A. 1987; Critchley 1999; Heinämaa & Oksala 2001; Hiddleston 2009; Drabinski 2013; Kallio-Tavin 2013.

549 Quote from Blanchot's (1993, 51-52) *The Infinite Conversation*. First published in French in 1969.

550 Wild 1969, 11.

551 Ibid.; Derrida 1999, 10-11; Hand 2009, 12-13; Kallio-Tavin 2013, 56.

552 Wild, 1969, 13.

553 Derrida AEL 1999, 11.

554 Heidegger *Being and Time* 1927/1972; see also Cohen R.A. (1998, xiii) in preface to Levinas' *Otherwise than Being*.

intentions to renew 'the question of *Being*' (*Dasein*) in a way that was caught up in the idea of individual solitude.⁵⁵⁵ What Levinas⁵⁵⁶ finds problematic in Heidegger's thinking is the way it places the freedom of the self before justice towards the other and hence fails to fully address the question of responsibility. Hence, Levinas' philosophy builds in particular on his dissatisfaction with Heidegger's vision of sociality which is at best a *being-with* (*Mitandersein*) rather than an interpersonal face-to-face relationship.⁵⁵⁷

Levinas' philosophical vision was influenced by his own early experiences of growing up in a Jewish family in Lithuania during the First World War. His post-war philosophy was undoubtedly shaped by his deep disappointment with humanity during the horrors of the Second World War and by his desire to understand why one human is capable of doing such things to another.⁵⁵⁸ Levinas was shocked by Heidegger's association with Nazism, which also explains the intensity of the critique that Levinas directed towards Heidegger's philosophy.⁵⁵⁹ Levinas' commentators have later pointed out that his presentation of ethics signalled a hopeful and much-needed idea of a different mode of being in the post-war climate.⁵⁶⁰

Levinas published his first two shorter volumes, *Time and the Other* and *Existence of Existens*, in 1947. Of these, *Time and the Other* in particular has been viewed not only as a critique of Heidegger's thought of being, but also as a clear and strategically important text on the nature of being, solitude, materiality, encounters with the Other and the Other's significance.⁵⁶¹ The work presents time not as the achievement of an isolated or lone subject, but as the very relationship of the subject with the Other.⁵⁶² After these volumes, Levinas continued to develop his explicit critique of the Western

555 See e.g. Levinas T&I, 51; 109-17; see also Derrida AEL 1999, 28; However, Levinas has been later on criticized for his reductive reading of Heidegger (see e.g. Drabinski & Nelson 2014.)

556 Levinas T&I 1969, 89; Hiddleston 2009, 17.

557 Hand 1998, 33.

558 Drabinski 2013.

559 Hand 2009, 34; Levinas' *Otherwise than Being* [first published in 1974, translated to English in 1981] was dedicated to the memory of the victims of National Socialists and anti-Semitism.

560 Hand 2009, 34; Hiddleston 2009, 17-23.

561 Wild 1969, 11 in Introduction of T&I; Hand 2009, 33.

562 Levinas T&O 1987, 39.

philosophical tradition, which he saw as being based on an ontology that tended to generate totalizing concepts of being.⁵⁶³ This then became pivotal argument in Levinasian ethics, which he discussed in detail in his first major work, *Totality and Infinity*, which was first published in French in 1961, and then translated into English in 1969.

Totality and Infinity is a work of ethical metaphysics where only a desire for goodness can do justice to the radical otherness of the other person.⁵⁶⁴ Levinas⁵⁶⁵ pairs *totality* and *infinity* with another in order to advance his critique of totalizing and restrictive definitions of *subjectivity*, *reality* and *metaphysics*. He writes that '[T]he idea of totality and the idea of infinity differ precisely in that the first is purely theoretical, while the second is moral'.⁵⁶⁶ By saying this, Levinas expresses his disappointment in Western philosophy, which in his view has treated ethics as a theoretical consideration and as a project of a spontaneous, free subject.⁵⁶⁷ In his words, '[T]he idea of the perfect is not an idea but desire; it is the welcoming of the Other, the commencement of moral consciousness, which calls into question my freedom'.⁵⁶⁸ This means that for Levinas ethics and morality occur as questioning the ego, the knowing subject, self-consciousness – or what Levinas calls (following Plato) as the Same (le même).⁵⁶⁹

In *Totality and Infinity* Levinas presents the *face* of the other as a moment of infinity that goes beyond any idea or description that one can produce of the other.⁵⁷⁰ Levinas' idea of face cannot be reduced to a fact or an obstacle. Instead, the *face* embodies all Levinas' aims in *Totality and Infinity*; the face of the Other is infinitely foreign and manifests the Other's inviolability and holiness.⁵⁷¹ For Levinas the face calls upon and obliges self to take on a responsibility that transcends, or goes beyond, knowledge. It issues us with

563 Hand 2009, 36; Ladyga 2012, 226; see also Ankor & Wearing 2002.

564 Cohen R.A. 1998, xii.

565 Levinas T&I 1969; see also O&B 1998; Hand 2009, 36; Ladyga 2012, 226.

566 Ibid. 83.

567 Ibid. 84.

568 Levinas T&I 1969, 84.

569 Ibid. 43; Derrida AEL 1999, 17-8; Critchley 1999, 4.

570 See e.g. Levinas T&I 1969, 151; 194-201.

571 Ibid.; Hand 2009, 42.

an absolute ethical challenge; it challenges all our philosophical attempts to systematize or thematize and therefore reduce the other.⁵⁷² In Levinas⁵⁷³ words, the notion of the face signifies ‘exteriority that does not call for power or possession’: it signifies the existence of fundamental pluralism, meaning that the other exists before the self.⁵⁷⁴ Although it does not feel right to summarize Levinas’ thought, it can be said that the idea of ethics presented in *Totality and Infinity* is radical in that it always begins from the Other, who is never a mere object to be subsumed to a category.⁵⁷⁵

While *Totality and Infinity* focuses on *ethical alterity*, Levinas continues to explore the idea of *ethical subjectivity* in his other major work, *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence*, which was first published as a book in 1974.⁵⁷⁶ This means that Levinas’ focus changed from the radical and overwhelming alterity of the Other to the effect of that alterity on subjectivity.⁵⁷⁷ In *Otherwise than Being*, he elaborates the idea of ethical metaphysics by turning back to the moral sensibility of the subject that is awakened by the other.⁵⁷⁸ He introduces another set of terminology in order to describe the role of language in establishing ethical relations that are *beyond being*. One of the key messages and clearly articulated lessons here is the actual ethical force of *saying*. Levinas frames his conception of the other person’s radical and irreducible alterity within the domain of language, that is, the *saying* and *said*.⁵⁷⁹ I will focus on this elaboration more in detail in my methodology chapter (Section 4.4.). In connection with *the saying* and *said*, Levinas presents the view that his task is not to construct ethics but merely to seek its meanings.

In *Otherwise than Being*, Levinas opens up the question of ethical subject anew by claiming that subjectivity and responsibility are not for the self,

572 Ibid.; Derrida AEL 1999, 21.

573 Levinas T&I 1969, 136; see also Derrida AEL 1999, 28.

574 Levinas T&I 1969, 305; Hand 2009, 43.

575 Wild 1969, 12-13; Kallio-Tavin 2013, 56.

576 Cohen R.A. (1998, xii) in preface to *Otherwise than Being*

577 Cohen R.A. 1987, 11; Hand 2009; 5.

578 Cohen R.A. 1998, xii

579 Levinas O&B 1998, 5-7, 153-62; See also Cohen R.A. (1987, 3) in preface to *Time and the Other*; Hand 2009, 51; Hiddlestone 2009, 18-9.

but *initially for the other*.⁵⁸⁰ This thinking on responsibility strictly follows the ousting of the subject from its masterful position vis-a-vis the other, for whom the subject is now responsible.⁵⁸¹ It means that for Levinas it is the ethical relationship *between* self and other which constitutes the social fabric. In *The Origins of Responsibility*, Francois Raffoul⁵⁸² writes that for Levinas responsibility is not the responsibility of the free subject, but responsibility that arises out of the demands that the other makes of me. Hence, when the self becomes the respondent who is first and foremost responsible for the other, responsibility is no longer limited to the measure of what 'I' foresee and want to do.⁵⁸³

In the foreword of *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence*, Richard A. Cohen⁵⁸⁴ suggests that the title and the content of the book alert us to the priority that Levinas gives to his critique and contestation of Heidegger's idea of *Being*. Levinas accuses Heidegger of trying 'to conceive subjectivity in the function of Being...'⁵⁸⁵ and uses a rather provocative rhetoric about the need to move 'beyond Being' and beyond ontology.⁵⁸⁶ In Cohen's⁵⁸⁷ words, the title could also be interpreted as 'Otherwise than Heideggerian *Being*; beyond Heideggerian essence'⁵⁸⁸ – beyond Heidegger's ontology of 'totality'. As Levinas' commentator Raffoul⁵⁸⁹ describes it,

For Levinas, the access to ethics (which for him should be raised to first philosophy) and to responsibility takes place in the rupture with ontology, that is, in a rupture with Heidegger. Far from being included within the horizon of being, ethics is situated in the relationship to the other person, in the "intersubjective..."

580 Levinas O&B 1998; E&I 1985, 96; Derrida AEL 1999; Raffoul 1998, 214; 2010.

581 Raffoul 2010, 164.

582 *Ibid.*, 163.

583 *Ibid.* 164; Lingis 1998, xx.

584 Cohen R.A. 1998.

585 Levinas 1998, 17;

586 Drabinski & Nelson 2014, 6.

587 See also Raffoul 2010, 167-70

588 Cohen R.A. (1998, xiii) in preface to *Otherwise than Being*

589 Raffoul 2014, 177.

In light of Levinas' interpretation, Heidegger's idea of being is an ontology that begins from and is directed towards self, while Levinas' ethics is metaphysical and strictly oriented towards the other. Levinas aims to distinguish his ethical philosophy – which relies on alterity and otherness – from the search for responsibility that leans on the conception of personal, individual good.⁵⁹⁰ However, it is important to point out that not many Heidegger scholars have been convinced or challenged by Levinas' criticism. Those researchers who have taken a thorough look at the relationship between the two philosophers have also called attention to Levinas' somewhat simplifying and weak reading of Heidegger's *Being and Time*.⁵⁹¹

Critique of Levinas does not end here. While writing so beautifully about the radical difference which trivializes our learned categories of difference, Levinas peculiarly fails to reckon with alterity in the transnational context.⁵⁹² Drabinski, among other commentators on Levinas' work, argues that while Levinas focuses extensively on European context, he also explicitly articulates the 'other Others' differences with cultural prejudices and chauvinism.⁵⁹³ By 'other Other' Drabinski refers not only to non-Europeans and Palestinians, but also to women, who sometimes appear to Levinas as so radical and alien that they do not register as obligating. As a consequence, the meaning of the Other in Levinas excludes, at least to some extent, the 'other Others' from the sphere of responsibility.⁵⁹⁴ Although Levinas⁵⁹⁵ addresses some of this critique in his later work, his writings exhibit inconsistencies that cannot be taken lightly.

But despite – and partly because of – these contradictions, Levinas' ethical philosophy has recently gained unprecedented popularity among commentators in theology, philosophy, political analysis and feminism who wish to

590 Woods 1997, 53; see also Raffoul 2014.

591 Although diving into these discussions would make a too long side-track to my own research story, newly published anthology (2014) *Between Levinas and Heidegger* edited by John E. Drabinski and Eric S. Nilson offers a great exploration of the topic.

592 Drabinski 2013, xii-xiii; Spivak (1993, 166-7) has also presented this kind of criticism about Levinas' writings.

593 Drabinski 2013, xiii, 2; for example of Levinas' way of writing about feminine, see *Totality and Infinity* (1969, 154-156).

594 Ibid., xiii; see also Ahmed 2000, 142-7; Ladyga 2012.

595 See for instance Levinas E&I 1985, 65-72; O&B 192, n27; Derrida AEL, 1999, 139.

carry his thinking further.⁵⁹⁶ While Levinas aims to describe something that cannot really be described in words in philosophy, reading Levinas requires almost a certain degree of forgiveness of occasional contradictions. In fact, the infinity of his thought makes him a human – the self and the other – who cannot be systematized and placed in a neat package. Derrida also writes that the work of Levinas ‘is so large that one can no longer glimpse its edges’.⁵⁹⁷ In the present study, I have, with great regret, chosen to leave out Levinas’ writings on God, holiness of the holy, death, sensibility, Eros and uprightness, among other thought-provoking themes.⁵⁹⁸

However, not even the idea of ethics as hospitality can be thoroughly explored within one research project. According to Derrida⁵⁹⁹ the notion of hospitality as ‘subject of welcome’ can be considered one of the overarching questions in Levinas’ thinking. In my study I draw on Levinas’ idea of welcoming and hospitality, and on Derrida’s interpretation and development of this thought, as guidance in gaining understanding about the formations of subjectivities in tourism development encounters. I suggest that Levinas’ thought can help to point out the ethical limitations of contemporary participatory encounters based on dichotomies between self and the other. Hence in envisioning more ethical encounters in tourism, I put forward the possibility of moving *beyond* the self-centred, individualistic idea of participation.

Accordingly, instead of applying the notion of hospitality as it has been widely used in the tourism industries, my theoretical framework aims to contribute to the recent discussions on ethics of social relations in the context of international mobilities.⁶⁰⁰ This engagement also means questioning

596 Peperzac 1995; Hand 2010; see also *The Third Wave of Levinas’ scholarship* edited by Atterton & Calarcos (2010).

597 Derrida AEL 1999, 3.

598 I also hope that I could have paid closer attention to Levinas’ thought on language and face as *traces* of the ethical. For *Trace*, in Levinas’ thought, see Section 4.4 on *Ethical Saying* in this book; See also Derrida AEL 1999, 53.

599 Derrida 1999, Raffoul 1998, 212; Especially in times of increasing global mobilities, Levinas’ idea of hospitality and responsibility can be seen more relevant than ever. Interestingly some of the Levinas’ commentators, such as, Critchley 1999; Hand 2009 and Drabinski 2013 do not seem to pay special attention to the conceptualization of hospitality as such.

600 see Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; Kuokkanen 2007, 130, writes how ‘hospitality requires reciprocity as well as participation between individuals, groups or entities’.

and resisting the assumption that our social relations might be permeated by the logic of the market⁶⁰¹. Veijola et al.⁶⁰² have previously asserted that

...the focus of tourism research has been laid extensively on the conditionality, limits and laws of hospitality while trying to close the door on the incalculable. The unexamined ontologies of many lines of tourism studies leave little room for thinking and doing togetherness between and among hosts and guests differently.

Knowing this, I suggest that Levinas' and Derrida's discussions on ethics and hospitality *do* provide a theoretical framework for approaching participation among hosts and guests apart from codes or laws of ethics. As Levinas⁶⁰³ makes clear, the idea of infinity – which is moral – should not be reduced to totality – which is theoretical. This means that from the perspective of totality, ethics are seen as something external and imposed; and, if one subscribes to the idea of infinity, ethics can be found in each of us.

I will continue to examine Levinas' idea of *welcome* as constitutive to ethical subjectivity and then move on to discuss the ways in which his ethical thought has been welcomed into recent discussions in postcolonial philosophy.

3.3 Subject as welcome

Although all intentions to describe infinity are assumed to fall short, searching for answers to the question 'What does welcome mean?' can help in trying to capture the conception of ethics in Levinas' work. The word *welcome* operates everywhere in his work to speak about the first gesture in the direction of the Other. In his analysis of Levinas, Derrida interprets the idea of welcome as consciousness and *attention* towards the other, as saying *yes* to the other.⁶⁰⁴ In his view, saying *yes* to the other means to speak

601 Mezzandra 2013; Vrasti 2013; Veijola et al. 2014, 9.

602 Veijola et al. 2015, 2-7.

603 Levinas T&I 1969, 83.

604 Derrida AEL 1999, 54.

the language of goodness, friendship and hospitality.⁶⁰⁵ Indeed, for Levinas the first word or response that makes all the other words and responses possible – including *no* – is the ‘unconditional *yes*’, a *yes* that is ‘older than that of naïve spontaneity’.⁶⁰⁶ However, in the idea of infinity there is no *first yes*; rather, the *yes* to the other is already a response. Hence, the ethical and responsible response to the other is surely a *yes*, but a *yes* preceded by the *yes of* the other.⁶⁰⁷

The profound and immutable ambiguity of hospitality is reflected in the French word *hôte*, meaning both ‘host’ and ‘guest’.⁶⁰⁸ Kuokkanen⁶⁰⁹ highlights that the etymology of *hôte* demonstrates the inseparability of ‘host and guest’ or ‘self and other’. This inseparability also means that there is never only one who could claim a mastery or sovereignty over the role of the host.⁶¹⁰ In Levinasian philosophy the idea of hosting and guesting turns into a game where both self and other are hosting (*hôte*) and being a guest (*hôte*). This means that the *hôte* can be the one welcoming (host) or the one being welcomed (guest).⁶¹¹ In this sense, hospitality and welcoming cannot be seen as the ‘duty’ of a host, but as a mutual virtue in ethical encounters.⁶¹² The way Levinas defines host or/and guest results in there being no subject ‘as a pre-given substantial identity that would constitute the basis for a capacity to welcome’.⁶¹³ This means that the subject is not a self-identity or an ego or consciousness. Instead the subject in Levinas’ thought is the very openness to the other – it is the subject that welcomes and receives the other ‘beyond its own infinite capacities of welcoming’.⁶¹⁴

605 Ibid. 5, 51; Levinas T&I 1969, 305.

606 Levinas NTR 1990, 49-50; see also Derrida AEL 1999, 3.

607 Ibid.

608 Kuokkanen 2007, 138.

609 Ibid.

610 Ibid. Or if there is, Kuokkanen writes (2007, 138), ‘this host is an arrogant imperial *hôte* (host/guest) and does not deserve either the right to hospitality, or the right to say welcome’.

611 Derrida, AEL 1999, 23-5; 41-3.

612 However, although it is a mutual virtue, it is always non-symmetrical, see Levinas T&I 1969, 215-16; 1985, 98-9.

613 Raffoul 2010, 214.

614 Ibid.; see also Levinas T&I 1969, 84.

One way to understand the idea of the ‘continuum between hosting and guesting’, as postcolonial philosopher Mireille Rosello⁶¹⁵ calls it, is to draw special attention to the prepositions between *welcome* and *the other*. Michel Serres, also a French philosopher, has pointed to the different ways in which the *prepositions* can be understood as *pre*-positions that indicate ‘relations that precede any fixed positions’.⁶¹⁶ The two prepositions central in this context are *of* and *to*: welcome *of* the other and welcome *to* the other. In *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* Derrida⁶¹⁷ aims to clarify the importance of these two prepositions in the following way:

... the welcoming *of* the other (objective genitive) will already be a response: the *yes to* the other will already be responding to the welcoming *of* the other (subjective genitive), to the *yes of* the other.

Both ‘welcome *to* the other’ and ‘welcome *of* the other’ (others’ welcome) call attention to self’s responsibility to welcome the other and to *the other’s* responsibility to welcome the *self*.⁶¹⁸ Raffoul⁶¹⁹ explains that acknowledging and understanding the welcome *of* the other as a subjective genitive (the other’s hospitality) means that the subject as host (*hôte*) immediately turns into a subject as guest (*hôte*). However, although these prepositions are fundamentally intertwined, they are not conditional on each other. That is to say that while I am responsible to say the unconditional word of welcome *to* the other, my welcome cannot be conditional or dependent on the welcome *of* the other. If my response *to* the other depended on the response I receive from the other, this would make my welcome conditional. Hence, Levinas⁶²⁰ idea of multiplicity in being and in infinitely open welcoming

615 Rosello 2001, 18.

616 Serres 1995, 105 in Veijola et al. 2014, 143; Please see Veijola et al. (2014, 142-147) discussion of ‘prepositions and other stories’ that focus on the preposition of ‘with’ in particular. I am grateful to Olli Pyyhtinen for training our focus on the prepositions.

617 Derrida AEL 1999, 23.

618 Ibid, 22-5.

619 Raffoul 2010, 216.

620 Levinas T&I 1969, 216; EI 1985, 98. I want to thank Tazim Jamal for drawing my focus on the inevitable asymmetries in welcoming.

requires acceptance that the ‘space’ where welcoming is situated is always asymmetrical. It requires consciousness and attention towards different kinds of hosts who express their welcome in multiple ways.⁶²¹ In *Totality and Infinity*, Levinas writes, ‘The other who obligates me in his transcendence is thus the stranger, the widow, and the orphan to whom I am obligated’.⁶²² Hence, in Levinas’ thought ethical subject – the subject of welcome – is the *host* who welcomes unconditionally the stranger, the neighbour, the Other.⁶²³

Derrida reflects on Levinas’ idea of Welcome:

We set off from thinking about welcome as the primary attitude of the self before the other, from thinking about welcome to thinking about the hostage. I am in a certain way a hostage of the other, and that hostage situation where I am already the other’s guest in my own home, that hostage situation defines my own responsibility.⁶²⁴

For Levinas⁶²⁵ the responsibility for the Other ‘is not an accident that happens to a subject, but precedes essence in it...’. In fact, it is not the idea of responsibility for the other as such that makes Levinasian thinking radical or alternative in comparison with other Western philosophers such as Kirkegaard⁶²⁶ and Heidegger⁶²⁷. Rather, it is his redefinition of ethics and responsibility in a thoroughly intersubjective and interpersonal way.⁶²⁸ For me the central contribution of Levinas’ idea of welcoming is the attention towards the welcome *of* the other (the other’s hospitality) – and the fundamental responsibility of responding to the other by unconditionally welcoming the other. Without highlighting the importance of this continuum of welcoming – of saying yes – the Levinasian idea of transcendence

621 Kuokkanen 2007, 139.

622 Levinas T&I 1969, 215.

623 Levinas T&I 1969, 299; E&I E&I 1985, 98-99.

624 Derrida (2003) in *Sur parole: Instantanés philosophiques* (French), translated and quoted by Hill 2010, 246.

625 Levinas OB, 1998, 114.

626 See for instance Fennell’s (2008) research on Kirkegaard in tourism context.

627 Raffoul 2010; 2014.

628 Levinas T&I 1969, 215-16; OB 1998, 111-12; Derrida 1999, 54-7; See also Baker 2013, 4; Raffoul 2014.

as a relational human 'affair' faces a great risk of falling to pieces. More specifically, it faces the danger of falling back into the realm of individual, spontaneous and free subjects, that is, subjects that might stand next to each other, even next to those who are marginalized or disempowered⁶²⁹, without the kind of 'reversals of subjectivity' that Derrida and Levinas talk about.

For Levinas, it is the very welcome which interrupts the self and the tradition of the autonomous, egological subject. Accordingly, Derrida⁶³⁰ asks '[I]s not hospitality an interruption of the self.' According to Derrida, one will understand in fact nothing about hospitality if one does not understand the idea of interrupting self.⁶³¹ The idea of interrupting self is alternative and opposite to the idea of freely saying 'as for myself, I, *ipse, egomet ipse*', which Derrida, like Levinas, calls the most powerful tradition of ethics and philosophy.⁶³² Hence it is not a surprise that in the dominant tourism discourses, the entire sector is characterized by, and also dependent upon, modernity's promotion of individualism.⁶³³ Tourism, unlike global flows of immigrants and refugees, is based on the idea of the free movement of individuals who are capable of exercising their choices as active consumers.⁶³⁴ In Mick Smith's⁶³⁵ words tourism is mobility of individuals who are 'more or less driven by egoistic desires for self-gratification'. Vrasti⁶³⁶ argues that even the recent search for more ethical forms of travelling, such as volunteer tourism in the Global South, are based on individualistic logic. In these kinds of settings, merely visiting the other seems to be perceived as a responsible and ethical act as such. Hence, it is too simplistic to claim that, for instance, NGOs are developing altruistic forms of travelling as opposed to hedonistic forms of mass tourism.⁶³⁷

629 For this kind of interpretation of Levinas' thought, see Davis 1996 in Ahmed 2000, 141; Ankor & Wearing 2012.

630 Derrida AEL 1999, 51.

631 Ibid., 51-2.

632 Ibid., 23; See Descartes and Cartesian cogito in Levinas T&I 1969, 92-3.

633 Smith, M. 2009a/b; for discussions on individualism in the context of rural tourism development, see George et al. 2009, 165.

634 For more on global mobilities and immobilities, see for instance, Germann-Molz & Gibson 2007; Salazar 2010, 5-16, 2013.

635 Smith, M. 2009b, 620.

636 Vrasti 2013.

637 For more nuanced discussions on mass tourism versus 'alternative forms of tourism, see Butcher 2012 and Vainikka's (2013) *Rethinking mass tourism*.

All things considered, tourism should not be treated as an exceptional playground for spontaneous individuals as this individualism has permeated our social lives nearly to an extent that it has become difficult to even recognize it.⁶³⁸ Even the entire idea of human development has been celebrated on a grand scale as freedom. Looking back at the history of this development, the idea of ‘global responsibility’ has largely been based on the image of active individuals from the industrialized countries helping the poor masses in the developing countries to participate in development and to become more like they are.⁶³⁹ In this conceptualizing of development, the right and freedom to become an individual and spontaneous subject can be seen as the ‘primary ends and principal means of development’.⁶⁴⁰ Both sides – those promoting development and those being developed – are drawn to celebrate the empowerment and freedom of the individual subject.⁶⁴¹ Today’s understanding (and indicators) of human development has been influenced by the work of Nobel Prize winning economist Amartya Sen.⁶⁴² His prominent book, *Development as Freedom*, argues that ‘without ignoring the importance of economic growth, we must look well beyond it’, meaning that attention should be shifted to individuals’ capacities for and capabilities of making choices that affect their lives. As critique by international relations scholar David Chandler highlights, in Sen’s idea freedom and development become defined in relation to the interior life of the individual subject.⁶⁴³

At its simplest, this could mean that ‘the freer you are, the more developed you are’. In this scenario the hope is that the ‘other’ will achieve progress in

638 Agamben, G. (1990/2007) *The Coming Community*.

639 On a larger scale, wealthy industrialized countries have helped the unit known as ‘Global South’. This is a common, and fundamental, act of ‘othering’ – something that forms a firm starting point for postcolonial critique. See Pakkasvirta & Teivainen 1992; Cooke & Kothari 2001; Eriksson Baaz 2005; Escobar 2012.

640 See Sen 1999, xii.

641 See also Chandler 2013, 67-9.

642 Sen 1999, 20; His thought is led by the idea that the role of income and wealth should be integrated into a broader and fuller picture of success and deprivation. See also Höckert 2009, 2011.

643 Chandler 2013, 67-9, 77-8. Chandler (2013, 5) writes ‘[F]or Sen, development is no longer a question of material transformation: development is no longer about external world. In fact, development disappears – it has no external material measurement – it is deontologized, or rather assumes the ontology of the human subject itself.

the form of material and human rights, yet in a way that keeps the privileges of 'the self' untouched. Taking seriously Levinas' idea of ethical subjectivity as hospitality – where the obligation to welcome and to do justice to the other questions one's freedom⁶⁴⁴ – would lead to an approach radically different from the tradition of autonomous subject.⁶⁴⁵ In Levinas' thought, the ethical relation is not simply a conscious decision made by a rational, ethical subject to be responsible to the other; instead, for him 'morality begins when freedom, instead of being justified by itself, feels arbitrary and violent'.⁶⁴⁶ This means that the decision and responsibility would no longer entail the development of 'egological immanence', but these would always revert to the other.⁶⁴⁷ Decision and responsibility would always be *of the other*, as Derrida⁶⁴⁸ phrases it.⁶⁴⁹

Although Levinas' work is firmly rooted in the drama of European history, his orientation to the other without any prerogative of conquest makes his work pertinent for postcolonial philosophy.⁶⁵⁰ In *Levinas and the Postcolonial* (2013) John E. Drabinski⁶⁵¹ suggests that it is the Levinasian ethical dimension that 'lies in the heart of so much theory (of postcolonial philosophy) as an underthematized cornerstone'. In addition to Drabinski⁶⁵², the philosophers Zuzanna Ladyga⁶⁵³ and Jane Hiddleston⁶⁵⁴ have explored

644 Levinas T&I 1969, 84; Derrida AEL 1999, 29.

645 Raffoul 2010.

646 Levinas T&I 1969; Hiddleston 2009.

647 Derrida AEL 1999, 53; Raffoul, 1998, 7.

648 Ibid. 23.

649 I agree with Judith Still (2010) who points out that Levinas focus' lies strikingly on the self (*même*) despite his idea of ethics that begins with the other. However, as Levinas' does not make difference between self (*hôte*) and other (*hôte*) – there are no determinable properties that make these two different from each other – would not it be meaningless to speak separately about self and the other? We can neither afford forgetting the ways in which Levinas' thought builds strongly on his own traumatic experiences of 'otherness' – of being the *unwelcomed* other – in the context of war and the persecution of Jews. So when Levinas underlines the importance of calling in question the freedom of the self, does not he speak to all of us, to each one of the 'selves'?

650 Ahmed 2000, 142; Hiddleston 2009, 16; see also Drabinski 2013

651 Drabinski (2013, 2) highlights that Levinas' insight of the other who accuses and obligates without prior experience is necessary when envisioning ethics in postcolonial encounters; see also Ladyga 2012.

652 Drabinski 2013.

653 Ladyga 2012.

654 Hiddleston 2009.

the ways in which postcolonial thinkers such as Gayatri Spivak, Franz Fanon and Homi Bhabha have been *implicitly* carrying Levinas' ideas to the boundary zone between ethics and politics.

Despite the fact that Levinas wrote his works during anti-colonial struggles and the rise of postcolonial critique, he was mainly concerned about a small part of Europe.⁶⁵⁵ However, just as Levinas was developing his notion of difference, theorists from the historical and cultural places of Levinas' 'other Other' theorized radical difference. Although the tone and resonance of the postcolonial debates were and are different, they ask very Levinasian questions, such as 'What does it mean to be on the margins of the knowable and the known?'⁶⁵⁶ By describing the 'other' as the weak, the poor and the marginal, Levinas' logic seems to have underpinned the work of subaltern scholars who became interested in mapping the links between the domain of ethics and the domain of politics of oppression.⁶⁵⁷ However, while postcolonial writers underline the ways in which historicity and materialist sensibility mediate the encounters between self and the subaltern other, Levinas' call for responsibility means responsibility beyond the historical, political and social context.⁶⁵⁸

Interestingly, Levinas' most loyal commentator, Derrida, did not seem to be disturbed by Levinas' legacy as a thinker who was European through and through. Instead, it was Levinas' work in particular that helped Derrida to lay emphasis on how colonialism operates within the very language of philosophy.⁶⁵⁹ Levinasian ethics came to strengthen Derrida's entire deconstruction of Western metaphysics and ethnocentrism⁶⁶⁰, which then had a significant and wide-ranging impact on postcolonial ethics.⁶⁶¹ In particular,

655 Drabinski 2013, xiv.

656 Ibid., xiii.

657 See e.g. Spivak 1988; see also Ladyga 2012.

658 See for instance Ahmed 2000; Drabinski 2013.

659 Critchley 1999; Hiddleston 2009, 104

660 Ibid., 22. Derrida writes about the blindness of the Western episteme or system of knowledge in *The Monolingualism of the Other*. He calls for questioning the self-deluding ethnocentrism by increased attention to the other. See also Hiddleston 2009, 100.

661 Hiddleston 2009, 103; She (Hiddleston 2009, 98) writes that the object of Derrida's analysis and deconstruction of the Western philosophical tradition was the creation of postcolonial ethics.

Spivak has constantly borrowed from both strands of postcolonialism – Marxism and post-structuralism on the one hand, and Levinasian ethics on the other. Notably, it was Derrida’s critical engagement with Levinas’ ideas that provided Spivak with tools for her work ‘deconstructing the colonial legacy of the anthropological paradigm and to formulate the conditions of possibility for an ethical dialogue with the subaltern.’⁶⁶² Hence, Spivak has been considered one of the few intellectuals putting into practice the suggestions made by the post-Enlightenment ethical movement associated with Levinas and also Derrida.⁶⁶³

It is clear that Levinas has left it to his commentators to explore whether his work actually has relevance on the ethical across borders, that is, to continue to explore what it would mean to infuse postcolonial explorations of difference with Levinas’ notions of the ethical.⁶⁶⁴ According to Drabinski⁶⁶⁵, this line of inquiry has not yet really begun in Levinasian scholarship; the scholarly debates have remained mainly in the European context. A rare exception is Enrique Dussel, who has opened up Levinas’ work towards the ‘other’ Other in his *Liberation Theology* using Levinas as ‘inspiration’ in his writings on intersubjective ethics and the philosophy of liberation in Latin America. However, the story goes that when Dussel asked Levinas why his work only addresses the horrors in the Holocaust, and not the millions murdered in conquest, slavery and under colonialism, Levinas answered ‘that is for you to think about’. Hence, as Drabinski⁶⁶⁶ highlights, Levinas turns the task of theorizing the disasters that define the historical experience of Latin America into a problem for the Americas.

Yet, a growing number of Levinas commentators have questioned the meaningfulness of trying to keep ethics somehow *local*.⁶⁶⁷ This movement unquestionably continues the work started by Derrida. Drabinski⁶⁶⁸ in

662 Morton 2007, 61.

663 Hiddleston 2009; Ladyga 2012, 221-30.

664 Drabinski 2013; see also Rosello 2001; Kuokkanen 2007.

665 Ibid.

666 Ibid., 3-4.

667 Ibid., 4-7.

668 Ibid.

particular calls for approaching Levinas' thinking in embodied, politicized space – on the boundaries of the ethical and political – in order to maintain the relevance of Levinas' work to contemporary theorizing about the ethical in global encounters. This means exploring the fruitfulness of Levinas' scholarship in questions of subalternity, migration and exclusion in transnational and transcultural contexts. The task is not only a matter of keeping Levinas alive as a thinker. The rhetoric of subalternity needs the Levinasian nuance of the ethical in order to retain its political and other purchase⁶⁶⁹, that is, to open up new kinds of ethical spaces for those in the 'margin'. This ethical space is the liminal sphere between ourselves⁶⁷⁰ – a space and a place which often remains closed in postcolonial writings.⁶⁷¹

In this study I approach hospitality as an alternative ontology (although Levinas would call it transcendence and metaphysics) that allows disruption of the boundaries between subjects and categories. I place a special focus precisely on the ways in which attention to the 'welcome *of* the other' and to one's responsibility to say 'welcome *to* the other' could open up spaces for more ethical encounters. This means underlining the importance of a continuum in hosting and guesting⁶⁷² – welcoming the other and being welcomed by the other.

3.4 Unlearning the privilege to enter

Let me just show how you looked to us. You came. You took things that were not yours, and you did not, even for appearance's sake, ask first. You could have said 'May I have this, please?' and even though it would have been clear to everybody that a yes or no from us would have been of no consequence, you might have looked so much better. Believe me, it would have gone a long way. I would have had to admit that at least you were polite.⁶⁷³

669 Drabisnki 2013, 11; see also Hand 2008

670 Levinas T&I 1969, 109.

671 Parry 2004, 23; Hiddelston 2009, 162.

672 Rosello 2001, 18.

673 Kincaid 1988, 35.

This is how Jamaica Kincaid explains Western colonialism's and imperialism's connections to the modern tourism industries in *The Small Place*. One of the many shared elements of colonialism, global tourism and development is the mobility where 'West visits the rest' and 'cores visit the peripheries', which makes it essential to acknowledge the postcolonial discourses in the theories and practices of tourism and development.⁶⁷⁴ In postcolonial debates the desire to arrive and help the other in the previously colonized countries is typically referred to as the 'white man's burden'. The idea was originally based on the 'backwardness' of the colonized and the position of the colonizer at the top of the evolutionary ladder.⁶⁷⁵ Hence 'the white man's burden' was seen as a duty to fix the colonized in a perpetual otherness.⁶⁷⁶ However, later on, the white man's burden – and also the 'white tourist's burden' – have been interpreted as the guilty conscience for the past and present exploitation of the 'other' which takes place in the world. As Vrasti⁶⁷⁷ writes about volunteer tourism, carrying the white man's, woman's and tourist's burden is normally perceived as an admirable sign of unselfishness that *demand*s applause.

Ultimately global tourism and development interventions – and especially the search for emancipatory solutions that bring progress – are based on the hegemonic discourses whereby self helps and guides and rescues the other. In these discourses the 'North' and the 'cores' maintain the position of superiority, agency and the role of an adult, while the child-like 'South' and 'peripheries' are taught and helped to follow linear, Western-style development as the norm.⁶⁷⁸ Despite the call for multiculturalism and acknowledgement of local knowledges, the problems and challenges are continuously found in 'peripheries', while the visitors from the 'cores' are perceived to be capable of providing the needed solutions. This mind-set allows subjects from the West and industrialized cores to be conserved. Here it merits to mention that the same kinds of unequal power relations tend to

674 See also McEwan 2009; Tosun 2005, 346.

675 Eriksson-Baaz, 2005, 37.

676 Ibid. 45; Bhabha 1994.

677 Vrasti 2013, 4.

678 Teivainen 2004; Li, 2007; Escobar 2012; Seppälä 2013, 11.

exist between ‘cores’ and ‘peripheries’ within countries in the Global South. Kuokkanen’s⁶⁷⁹ work on universities’ hospitality towards indigenous people and indigenous epistemes highlights the existence of ‘internal colonialism’ even within what has become known as the Global North.⁶⁸⁰

Sandra Talpande Mohanty⁶⁸¹ argues that the Western feminists who wish to ‘save the poor sisters in the South’ might also be repeating the same kinds of contradictory interventions as the ‘burdened white men’. Feminist postcolonial writers in particular have posed the questions of how to decolonize the mind, and for whom this decolonizing is relevant.⁶⁸² Kincaid’s narrative above reveals the need for new tools which can help to acknowledge and interrupt impolite or unethical behaviour when visiting other people’s islands. What I suggest here is that taking for granted the welcome *of* the other (subjective genitive) is a sign of a colonized imagination, mentality and heightened levels of individualism. The first step in the process of ‘decolonizing minds’ is to become aware of the ways and the contexts where such perceptions continue to be produced.

The asymmetry of intersubjective encounters becomes evident when the subjects are located in a particular topography and time; or when they are located, as the feminist, postcolonial scholars Ahmed and Spivak locate them, in a gendered body. Although these asymmetries are expected to be in constant change, depending on the contexts and subjects that are encountered, not all subjects have the same possibilities to mitigate these asymmetries.⁶⁸³ Especially scholars in the field of subaltern studies focus attention on the subaltern subject position, which has no access to the lines of social mobility or to the processes of cultural imperialism.⁶⁸⁴ Rather, subaltern subjects are those rendered voiceless and without agency by their social status.⁶⁸⁵ Spivak points this out in her now-famous question, ‘can the

679 Kuokkanen 2007.

680 For discussions on internal colonialism, see Mignolo (2008), Dussel (2013), Ranta (2014).

681 Mohanty, 1999.

682 McLeod 2010, 206; Mohanty 1999.

683 Veijola 1997; Ronkainen 1999; Jokinen & Veijola 2012.

684 Mignolo 2012.

685 Mohan 2004; Kapoor & Cotahari 2001; McEwan 2009, 16.

subaltern speak?'.⁶⁸⁶ This question calls for reflection on how the existing asymmetries might be re-constructed and maintained in the intersubjective relations between self and the subaltern other.

Subjectivities are not formed only in physical encounters with the other, but also through representations that are used to describe our encounters with the other.⁶⁸⁷ In her analysis of the subaltern speech in tourism, Cara Aithcinson⁶⁸⁸ calls attention to representations where 'the people in these landscapes (in 'tropical paradises') are frequently portrayed as passive but graceful recipients of white explorers from urbanized and industrialized countries'. However, the ethico-political implications of these kinds of representations are regularly dismissed even in the discourses of ethical tourism. Instead, concerns over practices that silence and de-subjectify the 'other' have mainly appeared on the fringes of tourism research.⁶⁸⁹ Those scholars who draw on postcolonial criticism argue that it is not only the phenomenon of ignoring the marginalized, but also the romantification of the subaltern that reproduces unethical representations of otherness and deepens the binary oppositions between active self and passive other.⁶⁹⁰

Spivak's work can be of help here, as her speciality lies in problematizing the intention to 'give the voice' to the subaltern other. Her sharp critique demands that one must acknowledge, as the very first step, that the combination of Eurocentric perceptions and trivialization of global inequalities might seriously limit the possibilities of envisioning ethically sound encounters within global tourism.⁶⁹¹ In other words, Spivak's⁶⁹² work helps to understand the various consequences of neglecting the wider structures of disadvantage and oppression. This challenges, for instance, the assumption

686 Spivak 1988, 283-4; 2000, 269-70..

687 Spivak, 1997; for postcolonial representations and worldmaking in tourism, see Hollinshead 2007, 2010; Ateljevic et al. 2012; Salazar 2013; Caton 2013. When discussing about the encounters that are mediated through representations, it becomes obvious that an intersubjective relation would always be an embodied one.

688 Aithcinson 2001; these kinds of representations in travel discourse is discussed also by Simmons 2004; see also Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

689 Hall & Tucker 2004; Higgins-Desbiolles & Powys Whyte 2013.

690 Aithcinson 2001; Kapoor 2004, 269; Smith, M. 2009a.

691 see Spivak 1988, 272-4, 283-4; Kapoor 2004

692 see also Willis 2005, 104-105 in McEwan 2009, 235.

that calling the ‘others’ ‘partners’ instead of ‘beneficiaries’ or ‘hosts’ instead of ‘locals’ would succeed in erasing paternalism and colonial legacy from the visitors’ minds.⁶⁹³ Hence, it is necessary to continue to reflect on the ways in which the colonial past and neo-colonial present continue to mediate even supposedly emancipatory encounters with the ‘other’.

Neglecting the legacy of colonialism and modern forms of economic and political exploitation is, as Spivak⁶⁹⁴ puts it, *epistemic violence*, a practice that forms a pertinent part of neoliberal orthodoxy. In consequence, the unawareness or ignorance of inequalities between self and other allows the maintenance of European ‘theatres of responsibility’.⁶⁹⁵ Unfortunately, even the majority of participatory tourism initiatives produce dramas which fit in well as scenes in this theatre. Tourism researchers Moscardo, Blackman and Murphy⁶⁹⁶ describe tourism projects through the analogy of a Greek tragedy in order to explain how different stakeholders engage in decision making. A valid question here is – and one that has troubled some scholars within community-based tourism studies – is why the role of the protagonists is so often played by the guests.⁶⁹⁷

Spivak, who has valuable insights into these kinds of settings, directs her concern especially to the epistemic or conceptual violence that shapes the relationships between the self and the other.⁶⁹⁸ What Spivak, Derrida and Levinas all agree on is *the impossibility of escaping epistemic violence when engaging with the other in discourse*.⁶⁹⁹ For them the ethical appears in language. In fact, it was Derrida’s approach to conceptual violence in *Of Grammatology* which helped Spivak to situate Derrida’s reflections on ethics and violence in terms of the history of European colonialism. In her work, Spivak criticizes our excessive zeal to speak for, and speak about, the ‘other’. Although I will return to the violence of representation in the methodology

693 Eriksson Baaz 2005, 6-12.

694 Spivak 1988, 280; see Höckert 2014, 108.

695 Morton 2007; see Höckert 2014.

696 Moscardo et al. 2014.

697 van der Duim 2006; Butcher 2007; Saarinen, 2010; Goodwin 2012.

698 Morton 2007, 61; see also Veijola & Jokinen 1998; Wearing 1998.

699 Derrida AEL 1999; Spivak 1988, 280; Levinas OB 1998.

chapter (Chapter 4.4.), I should clarify here that Spivak herself is unwilling to provide concrete help on how to represent the 'other' or encounter the 'other' through development projects, academic research, tourism advertisements, and the like. Instead, the main contribution of Spivak's reflections is to point out the dubious character of the privileged position which allows one to enter, master encounters between self and the other and produce representations of the other.⁷⁰⁰

Spivak's proceeding in negative terms makes one doubt whether ethical (non-violent) relations could actually ever flourish in tourism and development projects. However, her scepticism should not be interpreted as pure pessimism. It is clear that Spivak considers Levinas' account (in *Totality and Infinity*) of an ethical relation and an open dialogue between self and other to be impossible. Even Levinas⁷⁰¹ himself describes our interpersonal relations as always asymmetrical. However, Spivak still seems to be driven to understand the impossibility of ethical engagement for collective action. In other words, the impossibility of ethical and unconditional hospitality and ethical singularity should not be seen as a justification to ignore the unequal power relations between self and other. On the contrary, emancipatory interventions require acknowledgement of impossibility and acknowledgement of asymmetry. As I choose to interpret this, Spivak's thinking here calls for acknowledging inequalities in the spheres between self and other, where the risks and responsibilities of welcoming become negotiated.

A valid basis for discussion, in Spivak's view, is to try to expose our blind spots, for instance as Westerners or local 'elite', by challenging two assumptions.⁷⁰² The first is that the political desire of the 'oppressed' and the political interests of development experts are identical. That is, we should question the naïve and paternalistic belief that the 'other' is always willing to speak and participate, and is capable of doing so if *I* only listen and want her to speak and participate. The second assumption that must be questioned is that the voices of the 'other' could be recovered from the outside and that

700 For 'relative subalternity', see Dussel et al. 2008; for epistemic violence in tourism, see Veijola & Jokinen 1998.

701 Levinas 1969, 215-6; 1985, 98-9; Derrida AEL 1999, 23-4; 2002.

702 see also Kapoor 2004.

scholars can represent these voices as objective intermediaries. For Spivak⁷⁰³ the problem lies not in the inability of the other to speak, but rather in the unwillingness and incapability of the culturally dominant to listen. More specifically, Spivak takes the view that the privileged position which academic researchers and development consultants, for example, occupy is the reason why the 'locals' cannot be heard. Rather, the other is always already interpreted. As Spivak herself puts it, elite or hegemonic discourses are deaf to the subaltern, even when she or he speaks or resists.⁷⁰⁴ The consequences are trivialization and invalidation of ways of knowing that fall outside of the West's, and the local elite's, languages, epistemic traditions and philosophies. According to Spivak, these are consequences that can be described as epistemic ignorance and violence.⁷⁰⁵

Inspired by Spivak's example, I have modified her question '[C]an the subaltern speak?' to suit tourism scenes and the Levinasian idea of welcoming. My preliminary answer is that the subaltern in tourism rarely speaks, as her or his invitation to the other to visit and intervene is already taken for granted. That is, the subaltern other in tourism is the one whose welcoming is always taken for granted. This means that the other becomes relatively subaltern⁷⁰⁶ in the context of tourism. What is more, still following in Spivak's footsteps, the subaltern is never really welcomed – physically or in discourse – which results in the subaltern never gaining access to social mobility. According to Spivak⁷⁰⁷, it is the privileged (and mobile) position of the self which restricts the self's possibility to listen and welcome the other.

For this reason, Spivak⁷⁰⁸ challenges us and herself to *unlearn our privileges as loss*. The first part of this task requires noticing that one's class, race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, ideology, education, occupation, language, or

703 Spivak 1988, 280-4; 2000, 269-70.

704 Kapoor 2004, 639; Spivak, 1988, 283; for another example from Nicaragua, see Anja Nygren's (1999, 267-88) *Local Knowledge in the Environment-Development Discourse*. From dichotomies to situated knowledges.

705 Kuokkanen 2007, 66-8; Sharpe & Spivak 2002, 613.

706 For relative subalternity, see Moraña et al. 2008.

707 Spivak 1988, 272-4.

708 See also Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012; Seppälä, Laako & Junkka-Aikio 2014.

even access to the Internet can create relative advantage.⁷⁰⁹ Spivak⁷¹⁰ then asks us to think about what kind of prerogatives we – as individuals and groups – might have as visitors in this particular context. For instance, in tourism and development encounters, these relative advantages as dominant groups can be based on many roles, such as being a tourist, working for development, researching tourism, and so on.⁷¹¹ In fact, it seems like simply travelling from ‘the cores’ to ‘the peripheries’ strengthens the subjectivity of the mobile traveller. Or, as Sara Ahmed⁷¹² has expressed it, some of us are afforded agency within the global by relegating others to ‘local’ spaces. The travel itineraries of development workers and volunteer tourists, ‘the white men and women with their burden’, make sense as long as their hosts remain in the marginal space outside the hegemonic discourses. In other words, guests are allowed to presume the other’s welcome as long as the other is ‘not quite there yet’.⁷¹³ Hence, looking for a more equal relationship with the ‘other’ requires, as a starting point, acknowledging how one’s own active, privileged subjectivity becomes established through ‘freezing’ the other.

The second part of Spivak’s task of changing one’s mind-set by ‘unlearning one’s privilege as loss’ means recognizing one’s prejudices, preconceptions, and learned responses.⁷¹⁴ To put it in somewhat different terms, our prerogatives have given us only limited knowledge and prevented our gaining new understanding. As a result, we are simply not equipped to understand different ways of knowing.⁷¹⁵ Spivak’s approach means denying the idea of the Enlightenment that the world is expected to be knowable through observation. For her there are certain knowledges, experiences and existences that are closed off from

709 Sharpe & Spivak 2002, 617-8; Höckert 2014, 108-9; for discussion on ‘white bodies unlearning their privilege’, see Vrasti, 2013, 123-4.

710 Spivak 1988.

711 For analysis of identity and privilege in development aid, see: Kapoor, ‘Hyper self-reflexive development?’; Eriksson Baaz, *Paternalism of Partnership*; p. 106; for analysis of tourism, see Bergeå, *Class Travellers in Chicken Buses*; Vrasti, *Volunteer Tourism in the Global South*, p. 22.

712 Ahmed 2000, 172; I want to thank my colleague Piia Lavila at University of Helsinki for the discussion about this thought.

713 See also Bhabha 1994; Ahmed 2000; Tucker 2010; Dicks 2003, 52; Eriksson Baaz 2005

714 Spivak 2000, 20; Kapoor 2004; McEwan 2009, 68. This can be seen as the core of post-critical ethnography (chapter 4.1.), see e.g. Madison 2004.

715 Spivak 1988, 280, 284; Kuokkanen 2007, 3, 103.

the 'privileged view'.⁷¹⁶ As I understand Spivak's thinking, the desire to listen and to take into account, for instance, local knowledge is rather misleading. Notably, paternalistic intentions, unaware as they are of these limitations, can also be seen as a form of silencing, objectifying and trivializing the other.⁷¹⁷ It means pretending that the encounters between self and other are open and unconditional despite self's limitations in welcoming the other in discourse.

Spivak herself has been criticized for her tendency to silence the subaltern by focusing on the division between self and the other, of reinscribing – rather than disrupting – the authority of the privileged ones.⁷¹⁸ While other Gramscian historians have been blamed for their extensive optimism about the possibilities of recovering subaltern agency, for Spivak any attempts to do so appear almost pointless. Instead of laying emphasis on the relational construction of privileged and subaltern positions, Spivak seems to have answered this critique by becoming more cautious about using the concept of 'privileged' as such.⁷¹⁹ It is clear that *privilege* becomes an uncomfortable concept, especially if it is used for categorizing people as subaltern or privileged. However, these conceptualizations still are relevant when aiming to understand the attitudes and assumptions that shape our encounters with the other.⁷²⁰ For instance, a study in the US has shown that people who drive expensive cars tend to drive over crosswalks more recklessly than those sitting in more modest car models.⁷²¹ This could be interpreted as limited attention towards others and as lack of willingness to be interrupted by other people.⁷²² The same study indicated how people who win huge sums of money in the lottery tend to adopt superior attitudes towards others, although their relative privilege is based mainly on luck.

716 McEwan, 2009, 68.

717 Spivka 1988, 275-6; Seppälä 2013.

718 Hiddleston 2009, 163; Mohan 2004

719 See Sharpe & Spivak 2002.

720 For instance, according to a study done in the US, people tend to start to believe that they actually are better than others and in a privileged position, even if they have received their position without actually doing anything for it by themselves (e.g. lottery).

721 Piffa et al. 2011.

722 See Derrida (AEL 1999, 50-1) on ethical subjectivity and interrupting self.

In any event, my intention here is to place emphasis on the significance of Spivak's ideas in tourism schemes. I wish to propose that the privileged position of guests can undermine the possibilities of promoting more equal and responsible forms of visiting and travelling. So could it be that the pre-constructed categories of what tourism is and how it should help local communities most probably, unintentionally, restrict the subjectivities, choices and voices of the other? Or is it possible that the existing inequalities between the West and the Rest, or the core and the periphery, or haves and have-nots, might lead to settings where guests impose their definitions of development and sustainability in tourism.

In essence, if we understand subjectivity as a group of experiences with the others that keep shaping our imaginings, can we say that the imaginings and subjectivity of the mobile, privileged subject have been shaped by the ability to dominate the negotiations about the conditions and risks of hospitality? If the answer is yes, envisioning alternative encounters and decolonizing our minds will require unlearning our privilege of inhabiting a free, mobile, individual, cosmopolitan subject position as a loss, that is, recognizing one's privileged attitude towards the other, and unlearning the privilege to enter without welcoming the other.

The good news here is that we do not have to stop here. What comes after learning to unlearn one's privilege as loss is the possibility to learn anew.⁷²³ Tracing Levinasian ethics in Spivak⁷²⁴, I feel that she wants to encourage us to unlearn the individualistic and totalizing subject position and then, to learn to learn anew the idea of intersubjectivity, based on an openness and receptivity towards the other. Learning to learn anew through the Levinasian notions of hospitality and welcome is needed here in order to acknowledge and disrupt privileged attitudes and to envision more welcoming ways of being – not as a vision for the future, but as a change that happens in our imaginings at this moment, as a process of decolonizing mind-sets.⁷²⁵ If hospitality is seen as a way of being, ethical subjectivity means not enter-

723 McEwan 2009; see also Höckert 2014; Seppälä et al. 2014.

724 See also Ladyga 2012

725 This approach is similar to that of Suvi Ronkainen (1999) and Soile Veijola (1997, 31) who describe it as 'sociological fiction'.

ing the other's home, but welcoming and making space for the other in one's own.⁷²⁶ It is a desire to welcome the other and to respect the other's welcome. In the following, final section of this chapter I will try to draw together these discussions on ethical subjectivities.

3.5 Ethical encounters at home

The purpose of this theory chapter has been to explore the idea of hospitality as a call for making space for the other. I have approached this space as a sphere of physical, discursive and metaphysical encounters between ourselves; in essence, it is in these spaces that participation can take place. I have drawn in particular on the ways Derrida, Levinas and Spivak reflect on ethical dimensions of encountering the other, and directed my attention on their critique of the Western idea of the individually responsible and masterful subject. However, each scholar posits very different roles in the process of deconstructing and decolonizing different modes of postcolonial subjection and domination. In my opinion, Spivak brings into these discussions quite little hope about the possibilities of establishing more equal and open relations with the historically, epistemologically and materially exploited other. However, despite this apparent pessimism, she proposes that the only responsible thing to do is to keep trying to reduce the violence in the discursive spaces between self and the other. By contrast, Levinas' metaphysical thought represents a utopian optimism about the openness of these spaces. He seems to deliberately ignore the historicity and materiality of our experiences that shape our desire and possibilities to limit these spaces.⁷²⁷ In turn, while Derrida's writings can be read as encouragement to move towards the Levinasian idea of infinitely open welcoming, Derrida underlines the necessity to negotiate the conditions and ethics of hospitality again and again depending on the case and context.⁷²⁸

726 Veijola 1997, 35-6; Grit 2010, 2014; Germann-Molz 2014.

727 Drabinski 2013, 11; see also Oksala 2001, 73.

728 Derrida AEL 1999, 21; 2002, 2, 14; Baker 2010, 89.

The most fruitful context must be a *home* – physical or metaphorical – for it offers many different levels of analysis and abstraction. Thinkers encouraging us to seek more hospitable homes can consider the globe as our common home,⁷²⁹ an entire hemisphere as the home of the ‘other’⁷³⁰, or homepages as the home of a virtual community.⁷³¹ While it is often unclear whether a continent offers a common home for the countries on that continent⁷³², most of us consider that we *do* have our own home country. For instance, Drabinski⁷³³ proposes that home is like a state: a state of exclusion that, on reflection, points to a resulting excessive responsibility for the one who is excluded. As we have experienced so strikingly in 2015, it is at the moats, boundaries and walls of these homes that the problems and possibilities of ethics and politics begin.⁷³⁴ There are also home regions, home towns, houses that offer a home for a community, family homes, second homes, and so on. All these have fallen under scrutiny even in tourism studies. Then there are ontological homes⁷³⁵, also called *chora*⁷³⁶ or *habitation*,⁷³⁷ which we imagine either sharing or occupying alone.

Rauna Kuokkanen⁷³⁸ uses the concept of doing one’s *homework*, drawing on Spivak, in order to make epistemic space for the other. In Spivak’s words, the process of doing one’s homework implies the need to reflect on and unlearn one’s privileges and biases and learn to learn anew. Hence, this homework is not something one could actually be able to finish. Instead, it is an ongoing task, or an ongoing practice, which calls upon us ‘to scrutinize the historical circumstances and to articulate one’s own participation in the

729 For discussions on cosmopolitanism, see Kant’s *The Home and the Worlds* in Jamal & Hill 2002; Still 2010; and see also Rosello 2001.

730 For postcolonial critique of discourses that categorize ‘Third World’ or ‘Global South’ as homogenic units, see Spivak 1988, 271; 291; Kapoor 2004, 634; Escobar 2012.

731 Germann-Molz 2007; 2012.

732 Pakkasvirta 2005.

733 Drabinski 2013, 189.

734 *Ibid.*; for Derrida’s writing of refugees or ‘sans-papiers’, see *Negotiations* 2002, 142-3; and see also Rosello 2001.

735 Heidegger 1927/1972.

736 Grosz 1995; Ankor & Wearing 2013, 180-1; Germann-Molz 2014.

737 Levinas T&I 1969, 151-6, 165.

738 Kuokkanen 2007, 117.

structures that have fostered various forms of silencing' or exclusion of the other from discursive spaces. This means that for Spivak the question of ethics is actually not a question of knowledge, but most of all a question of relationship⁷³⁹. Although Spivak and Levinas seem to agree on the relational nature of ethics, they disagree on whether opening self to postcolonial difference would require engaging in conscious work. While Spivak⁷⁴⁰ underlines the importance of engaging in 'painstaking labor' when doing one's *homework*, in Levinasian phenomenological thought the ethical relation between self and the other does not denote a similar kind of conscious act of a rational subject. Rather, for Levinas, the responsibility for the other comes from the call *of* the other, which is always prior to the self's knowledge.⁷⁴¹

In phenomenological philosophy, thinking about being and becoming is already thinking about the origins of ethics; actually, *ethos* is understood in its original Greek meaning as 'home'. For instance, Heidegger⁷⁴² describes philosophy as 'a form of homesickness; as an intellectual desire to find a way of being at home in the world'. For the most part, phenomenology was born of this homesickness and longing for answers and understanding ideal ways of being.⁷⁴³ This has included questioning the 'nature' of social life itself⁷⁴⁴ – of being at home with and without the others. According to Levinas⁷⁴⁵, both hospitality and ethics refer to the dwelling where you receive the other. This is also where Heidegger's and Levinas' thinking diverge. While Heidegger describes dwelling or sojourning as being 'at home with oneself', for Levinas the other is the one who 'disturbs the being at home with oneself'.⁷⁴⁶ Hospitality as ontology means making space for the other

739 Spivak in Kuokkanen 2007, 115.

740 Spivak, 1995, xxiv.

741 Derrida AEL 1999, 22-6; Morton 2007, 61-62; see also Hiddleston 2009,

742 Heidegger (1927/1972) quoted by Smith, M 2009b, 628; See also Pernecky & Jamal 2009, 1056; And also Jamal & Stronza's (2008, 318) article on 'Dwelling in the Peruvian Amazon'.

743 Heinämaa 2002, 266.

744 Crossley, 96, 174.

745 Levinas T&I 1969, 152-5; for Derrida's interpretations of home and people without a home, see AEL 1999, 28, 41-5, 53-5; and for extending one's home through phone lines and internet OH 2000, 51.

746 Levinas T&I 1969, 37; 155-60; Hand 2009, 39-40. Please notice that this is how Levinas *interpreted* Heidegger's thought. See Drabinski & Nelson's (ed.) 2014 *Between Levinas and Heidegger*.

in one's home and sharing that home with the other. Levinas⁷⁴⁷ explains that 'I welcome the Other who presents himself in my home by opening my home to him'. For him it is a joy in living to receive the 'other' into her or his space. In this sense, ethical subjectivity is not about entering and visiting, but about welcoming, being and dwelling at home with the other.⁷⁴⁸ Therefore, according to Levinas' idea of radical intersubjectivity, we are never home alone as the consciousness is *to be* for-the-other.⁷⁴⁹

For Levinas⁷⁵⁰, whose home is primarily a metaphysical one, the subject of the welcome is in his *home* in the home of the other. Home is a place where we are with the others, where we share with the other, and where we are responsible for the other – for all the others. In Levinas' home, being is beyond being – beyond self. It is different from the home of the subjectivist design, where the other is assumed to stay in her or his home. In Levinas' home the self is there for the other to an extent where the roles of the hosts and guests become confused and even cease to exist.⁷⁵¹ It is a radical idea which requires that the host gives away her or his status as a host, which according to Levinas is a prerequisite to an equal relation between *hôte* and *hôte*.⁷⁵² However, it is unclear whether Levinas home has thresholds or walls or whether it is constructed with an unfinished and infinitely welcoming design that allows the other to enter. Levinas is not consistent in this matter. He writes, '[T]he possibility for the home to open to the Other is as essential to the essence of the home as closed doors and windows'.⁷⁵³

In any case, it is obvious that the meanings Levinas assigns to ethical encounters are not something that could be located in the history books of previous meetings between self and other. Most likely physical, or even transcendental, worlds do not consist of equal and ethical relations that are based on mutual welcoming and receptivity. For this reason, some might

747 Levinas T&I 1969, 171.

748 Derrida AEL 1999, 52; Hiddleston 2009, 20.

749 Levinas OB 1998 in Drabinski 2013, 95.

750 Levinas T&I 1969, 173; Raffoul 1998, 10; Derrida AEL 1999, 36.

751 See also Veijola and Falin 2014 on 'Mobile Neighboring'.

752 Derrida AEL 1999, 41.

753 Levinas T&I 1969, 273.

want to claim that Levinas' ethical phenomenological approach is a quasi-theory which is not 'true', or cannot say anything about the 'real world'.⁷⁵⁴ However, even though we may not be able to grasp the ethical 'for-the-Other' subjectivity in temporal, spatial and linguistic configurations⁷⁵⁵, for Derrida the Levinasian philosophy of openness as the fundamental structure of subjectivity is still the oasis that we should aim for.⁷⁵⁶ Most importantly, the idea or law of unconditional hospitality makes it possible to move beyond Kantian ethics as conditions of hospitality based on laws and politics.⁷⁵⁷ In other words, as Baker⁷⁵⁸ proposes, it allows a shift from the universal *accounts* of otherness characteristic of Kantian ethics towards universal *openness* to the other. According to Baker⁷⁵⁹, for Derrida 'it is a condition of all acts of conditional hospitality that they have this unconditional hospitality to aspire and fall short of'.

Yet, opening one's door to all the others, giving away one's role as a host reveals a paradox which is crucial for Derrida's thought on the ethics of hospitality. It leads to a situation where, sooner or later, there will no longer be a home to which the other could be welcomed.⁷⁶⁰ In other words, as Germann Molz and Gibson⁷⁶¹ argue, 'absolute hospitality requires us to go beyond, even beyond the very conditions that enable a state or a person to offer hospitality at all'. This means that although the Levinasian idea can offer a glimpse of a cure to those suffering from homesickness – from longing for the ideal ways of being – it simultaneously creates the greatest anxiety of moral consciousness: we are put out of home with ourselves and others just at the moment we experience responsibility.⁷⁶² As a consequence,

754 For more discussion on the topic, see Ronkainen, Pehkonen, & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2011, 26.

755 Drabinski 2013, 96.

756 Derrida AEL 1999, 21; 2002, 95, 101.

757 Derrida AEL 1999, 19-20, 48-50.

758 Baker 2010, 88; see also Still 2010, 7.

759 Baker 2013, 3.

760 Derrida AEL 1999; see also Baker 2010, 88, 91.

761 Germann Molz & Gibson 2007, 5.

762 Drabinski 2013, 166. At the same time, Levinas (T&I 1969, 173) also recognizes the importance of having a home with windows and doors.

as Derrida suggests, the binary relationship between unconditional and conditional hospitality is inseparable.

... conditional laws would cease to be laws of hospitality if they were not guided, given inspiration, given aspiration, required, even by the law of unconditional hospitality. These two regimes of law, of *the* law and the laws, are thus both contradictory, antinomic, *and* inseparable. They both imply and exclude each other, simultaneously.⁷⁶³

Thus, it is the double law of hospitality – negotiation and calculating between the poles of unconditional and conditional hospitality – where responsibility becomes possible.⁷⁶⁴ Between these two laws of hospitality is the threshold, or the space, where ‘the conditions, the norms, the risks, the rights and the duties’ of welcoming become negotiated.⁷⁶⁵ Thus, while unconditional, pure hospitality is never possible as such, according to Derrida the choice to *not* negotiate makes hospitality even more impure.⁷⁶⁶ It would mean settling for Kantian laws of hospitality based on conditions which maintain the unequal access to mobility and welcome.⁷⁶⁷ Clearly, moving towards more ethical encounters, towards ethics of hospitality, require negotiation.

The situation where the ethics of hospitality must become conditional in order to function leads to what Baker calls ‘undedicability’. In his opinion, drawing always on Derrida, there can be no comprehensive or final answer to the question of ‘what to do?’⁷⁶⁸ Baker⁷⁶⁹ explains:

If the Law of unconditional hospitality could be codified then there would be nothing left to decide and therefore no responsibility. Ethics, understood as synonymous with knowledge, would determine action

763 Derrida 2000, 80-1.

764 Baker 2010, 92.

765 Ibid.; Derrida 2000, 87; see also Kuokkanen 2007.

766 Derrida 2002, 14; see also Bonney 2012, 57.

767 According to Levinas, it is not that this priority of the welcome of the other would give the right to the other to welcome – but it calls for mutual openness and receptivity.

768 Baker 2010, 89; for propositions and infinity, see Derrida AEL 1999, 22-4.

769 Baker 2010, 92, drawing on Derrida’s thought in *Aporias* (1993, 16-17).

and apparently responsible decisions would in fact become merely 'technical applications' of some 'pre-established order'.

Instead, reaching towards ethics of hospitality requires constant negotiation and fresh decisions; in other words, these can be seen as prerequisites of responsibility. As Baker⁷⁷⁰ argues, 'Undedicability becomes a condition of ethical action rather than an obstacle to it'. In addition to circumventing any need to create 'codes of conduct' for ethics of hospitality, Derrida denies the possibility of defining general, pre-set rules for the negotiations. Instead, '[N]egotiation is different at every moment, from one context to the next. There are only contexts, and this is why deconstructive negotiation cannot produce general rules, or 'methods'.⁷⁷¹ I will carry this thought with me into the next chapter, which discusses hospitable methodologies.

In sum, I began the chapter by describing Derrida's reservations about the limitations of Western thought on hospitality, which has been concerned with defining the conditions for invitation. My intention there was to describe how engaging in hospitality between ourselves includes a readiness to share one's home with the other, and a readiness to be interrupted by the other. My suggestion is that these principles are equally relevant in the context of participation; that is, like hospitality, participation is a way of being and doing which means being together and doing togetherness with others. Consequently, envisioning more ethical ways of encountering the other requires not only welcoming the other, but also broadening one's perspective from the issue of invitation towards the issue of visitation. In other words, heightened attention to and respect for different ways the 'other' makes space for the self.

770 Baker 2010, 92.

771 Derrida & Rottenberg 2002, 7; see also Bonney 2012, 56-7.

4 HOSPITABLE METHODOLOGIES

The purpose of this chapter is to move towards the analysis of the data by discussing how the thoughts presented in the preceding chapter, on welcoming, intersubjectivity and co-construction of knowledge, could be operationalized and applied in ethnographic research. It is clear that conducting fieldwork, collecting data, making knowledge claims or representing the other are never innocent, objective or neutral activities.⁷⁷² As Michael Agar⁷⁷³ phrases it, an ethnographer is actually the stranger who comes into a space where others are familiar with each other. He claims that

ethnography is really quite an arrogant enterprise. In a short period of time, an ethnographer moves in among a group of strangers to study and describe their beliefs, document their social life, write about their subsistence strategies...'

In her book *Decolonizing methodologies*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith⁷⁷⁴ draws attention to the dirtiness of the word 'research', especially in the indigenous worlds. Despite the ongoing efforts to decolonize knowledge production, and despite the rich history of ethnographers experimenting with different research strategies, sites and styles of storytelling and presentation⁷⁷⁵, there are groups of people who are no longer ready to be objects of academic research.⁷⁷⁶ As a consequence, these groups have taken different actions to

772 Madison 2004; Jamal & Everett 2007, 58.

773 Agar (1980) quoted in Ahmed 2000, 59.

774 Tuhiwai Smith 2012, xi.

775 Marcus 2012.

776 Researchers' eagerness to study indigenous cultures become described in jokes like: "How many people live in a Sámi family in Lapland? Mom, dad, 1,5 children and a researcher."

limit their hospitality towards researchers. Just as development practices have changed from developing *for* to developing *with* the other, so, too, researchers have been challenged to search for alternative epistemic standpoints which would be open to the idea of knowing with.⁷⁷⁷

Moving from development encounters towards research encounters means, in addition to trying to live up to the epistemological and methodological criteria of academic research, facing the same ethical issues that are relevant in the context of development.⁷⁷⁸ This chapter claims that just as in participatory projects, in academic research the ethnographic subject might not be able to speak; instead, the 'other' is always already interpreted. Merely encouraging others to participate in the production of knowledge does not automatically decolonize the power relations between self and the other. Hence, methodological openness also requires asking *whether* and *how* the 'other' is welcomed throughout the research processes. However, the previously presented philosophers of ethical subjectivities have not engaged in writing practical advice for conducting fieldwork – or entering and visiting the homes of others in order to collect information about them and their homes.⁷⁷⁹ In fact, according to Spivak, among others, the entire idea and question of method is quite violent as such.⁷⁸⁰ Likewise, as Vrasti⁷⁸¹ argues, in its openness and hermeneutic nature ethnography as a methodological approach can also be seen as a critique of method.

How then is one to conduct an empirical study that could move from using invasive research practices towards using more hospitable, or at least less violent, methodologies? I address this question in the following four sections of this chapter. I first take a look at the previous intentions of decolonizing research methodologies, focusing especially on the development and transformation of ethnographical approaches. I will describe here how my study has been inspired especially by those methodological discussions which encourage researchers first to reflect on our privilege and position,

777 Veijola 1997; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012.

778 de Sardan 2005, 202; Blazer, 2012.

779 Sharpe & Spivak 2002.

780 Ibid; and see also Ahmad 2001; Drabinski 2012.

781 Vrasti 2010.

and second to embrace serendipity and ethics in research encounters. One example of this kind of methodological approach is dialogic critical ethnography or post-critical ethnography. The second section describes in detail the process of longitudinal ethnographic study which I undertook in Nicaragua between 2007 and 2013. My intention there is to explain the ways in which the processes of collecting and analysing the data became intertwined during the research journey. More than anything else, this experience has allowed me to reflect on my own openness and responsibility towards the participants of the study. The purpose of the third part of this chapter is to explain why and how I have collected and examined the data using hermeneutic phenomenological analysis. In my view the hermeneutic circle developed by the phenomenologist thinkers Heidegger, Gadamer and van Manen includes the very Levinasian ideas of openness, infinity and unfinishedness.⁷⁸² I conclude the chapter by addressing the issues of representation and worldmaking through academic research.

4.1 Decolonizing methodologies

Researching tourism development encounters brings together the issues of mobility and knowledge. Judith Adler, in her *Origins of Sightseeing*⁷⁸³, and Mary Louise Pratt, in her *Imperial Eyes*, trace the ways how travelling has been historically intertwined with ways of knowing and mastering the world. Germann Molz⁷⁸⁴ suggests how Adler's history of sightseeing could be read as a genealogy of the relationships between tourism and production of knowledge; that is, how travelling practices should be understood as a part of the historical development of 'orientations toward the problem of attaining, and authoritatively representing knowledge'.⁷⁸⁵ In addition to Adler and Pratt, authors such as Clifford, Edensor, Blazer, Salazar and Tuhiwai Smith, amongst others, have encouraged their readers to acknowledge the colonial

782 See also Dussel (2013, 270-8) on 'Phenomenological thought' of Levinas.

783 Adler 1989.

784 Germann Molz 2011, 91.

785 Adler 1989, 8.

antecedents of contemporary tourism research, anthropology or ethnographic fieldwork.⁷⁸⁶ This means asking how the purposes and ways of conducting research might and should differ from the ways in which Western officials, missionaries, explorers and intellectuals used to collect reports and stories about the ‘wild savages’ and ‘primitive populations’ of the colonies.⁷⁸⁷

The major questions of cultural studies – universalism versus realism, ethnocentrism versus cultural relativism, human versus nature – were posed and discussed by philosophers such as Rousseau, Montesquieu and Diderot already in the 18th century.⁷⁸⁸ However, it was only in the early 1900s that anthropologists, as the first group of researchers, undertook to set the academic rules in order to distinguish themselves from those writing memoirs, travelogues and journalistic reportage.⁷⁸⁹ They developed a criteria for *ethnographic* research which included: a lengthy stay in the field, learning and working in local languages, committing to cultural relativism, and trying to become as much a part of the group being studied as possible in order to gain ‘an insider’s perspective’.⁷⁹⁰ As the discipline of anthropology was driven by a fascination with cultural difference, exoticism and geographical distance, the early days of ‘classic’ ethnography became associated with a long-term fieldwork-based study of a specific group of people in an isolated, distant, rural geographical location.⁷⁹¹ Probably needless to mention that the ‘scientific experiments’ of the first ethnographers struggled, and sometimes simply failed to distance themselves from the Eurocentric assumptions and imperialist agendas that used to inform the antecedents of ethnographic writing.⁷⁹² In fact, sustained critique that questioned many of the underlying assumptions of so-called classical or conventional ethnography, emerged only later in the twentieth century.⁷⁹³

786 See also the recent article by Chambers & Buzinde (2015) on ‘Tourism and decolonisation: Locating research and self’; and also Tucker & Akama 2009.

787 Ibid.; Tuhiwai-Smith 2012.

788 See Hylland Eriksen’s & Sivert Nielsen’s (2001, 13–5) discussions on the most pivotal philosophers in the 18th century – including these three.

789 Pratt 1986, 27; Murchison 2010, 4–11.

790 Ibid., Clifford 1986.

791 Ibid.

792 Vrasti 2010, 83; For these kinds of examples, Murchison 2010 makes a reference to the study by Margaret Mead (1928) *Coming Age of Samoa*.

793 Murchison 2010, 8.

One of the most problematic dichotomies, which in some sense still exists, was the way in which local communities ‘over there’ were seen as sources of raw material for developing theories ‘over here’. The implicit assumption that ‘the valuable and legitimate’ knowledge would be developed and conserved outside the communities studied, most of all in the cores in the West, were criticized especially by postcolonial scholars as highly imperialist and problematic for several reasons.⁷⁹⁴ First, the assumption perceives the other as an object of knowledge and in this way reconstructs the colonial subject positions. Second, it strengthens – instead of questions – the Western and ethnocentric epistemes where ‘other cultures’ become translated into the language of the one who knows.⁷⁹⁵ Third, separating fieldwork from theory, or reality from interpretation, overlooks, as Veijola and Jokinen⁷⁹⁶ argue, the presence of the researcher’s body in the fieldwork encounters.

Since the 1970s, the process of disrupting and decolonizing the Western-centric production of knowledge became supported by the feminist standpoint scholars who encouraged researchers to engage in critical reflectivity by exploring the personal, the political and the situated nature of research processes.⁷⁹⁷ The first standpoint theorists, such as Sandra Harding and Donna Haraway, argued that reality lies in the lived experiences of people within their situations and contexts.⁷⁹⁸ Ever since, as Ronkainen⁷⁹⁹ notes, the demand for conscious reflexivity about what is known and how this is presented as knowledge, has formed the core of feminist research. The central intersections between postcolonial theory and feminism are the concepts of gender, race, ethnicity and class which are seen as the ground, as Tucker and Akama⁸⁰⁰ describe it, ‘for “internal colonialism” in which

794 Said, 1985, 1989; and see also Asad 1973, 1994 in Jordan & Yeomans 1995, 390; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

795 Ahmed (2000, 58-9) argues that ethnography can still, in the 21st century, be seen as an explanatory and accumulative discourse which translates a strange culture into the language of the one who knows.

796 Veijola & Jokinen 1994; Veijola 1997.

797 Humberstone 2004.

798 Ibid. 123; see for instance Harding ed. (1987) *Feminism and Methodology, Social Science Issues*.

799 Ronkainen 2004, 69.

800 Tucker & Akama 2009, 505.

identities are constrained and oppressed, and selectively represented'. However, the long tradition of feminist theory on ethnography has since been over followed by postmodernism, which also contributed to challenging the positivist and dualist modes of praxis in qualitative research through 'rewriting ethnography'.⁸⁰¹

The reflective turn of ethnographic research is commonly located around the year 1986, when Clifford and Marcus⁸⁰² published the most-cited and best-known critique of ethnography, *Writing Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Turning attention to the richness of ethnographic fieldwork as a form of interpretive knowledge production, it laid emphasis upon the understanding of understanding.⁸⁰³ By bringing reflectivity and ethicality into the centre of ethnographic research, ethnographers were required to address the issues of *perspective* and *bias*, as well as the ethical obligations to the people with whom they work.⁸⁰⁴ This meant reflecting on self's relation to the 'other' and on the ways in which ethnographic research might rather (re-)construct than 'describe' otherness.⁸⁰⁵ Ever since, ethnography has expanded rapidly beyond anthropology and beyond the settings where the 'West studies the rest'. Scholars from a wide range of disciplines, including tourism research, choose an ethnographic research strategy as the most suitable one for studying actions, cultures and social organizations in their everyday contexts. However, the expansion and popularity of ethnography have not reduced the importance of addressing the unequal power relations in research, and the risks to simplifying the diversity of lived experiences.⁸⁰⁶

Tourism and hospitality research agendas are commonly constructed using Western epistemologies as lenses, which then guide the (re)interpretation of tourism and hospitality phenomena outside Western contexts.⁸⁰⁷ What is more, until recently, only on odd occasions were tourism research-

801 Jordan & Yeomans 1995, 395; see also Castañeda 2006, 98; Vradi 2010, 87.

802 Clifford & Marcus 1986; see also Marcus (2012) in Hämeenaho et al. 2014, 31.

803 Jordan & Yeomans 1995, 394; Cerwonka, 2007, 2; Marcus 2012.

804 Murchison 2010, 8.

805 Asad 1973 in Ahmed 2000, 57; Clifford 1986; see also Castañeda 1991, 216 in Veijola & Jokinen 1994, 147.

806 Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

807 Ibid.

ers explicitly discussing the values and ideas that influenced their choice of topics and the research methodologies and methods they employed.⁸⁰⁸ A single, but concrete piece of evidence is the fact that the leading tourism journal, *Annals of Tourism Research*, begun to accept articles written in the first person only a couple of years ago.⁸⁰⁹ This meant that the field of tourism research was for a long time stuck in the traditional and depersonalized accounts that lacked profounder acknowledgement of the researchers' roles and responsibilities in the creation of theories and realities.⁸¹⁰ Hence, it has only later been recognized how the ethnocentric perspectives do not only shape our representations of the other, but also hinder researchers in understanding tourism phenomena from other perspectives and standpoints.⁸¹¹ Consequently, as Jamal and Everett⁸¹² argue, the lack of reflexivity has been dampening the epistemological discussions amongst tourism scholars.

In their fictive journey to Mallorca in 1994, Veijola and Jokinen were one of the first tourism scholars who embraced the subjectivity and embodiment of the researcher and called for reflection of one's positionality in academic research. Later, Caton⁸¹³, amongst others, has underlined the importance of tourism studies freeing itself from the 'chains of positivism' as the dominant mode of producing knowledge. A growing number of tourism scholars have indicated their disappointment with mainstream tourism research, which has been 'biased in favour of business applications rather than critical and reflexive research'.⁸¹⁴ It has been these critics who have pointed out the urgent need to explore the power structures, inequalities and ideologies that define different

808 See, for example Belsky 2004, 274; Phillimore & Goodson 2004.

809 See Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Tucker 2010, 931.

810 Botterill 2001, 199; Phillimore & Goodson 2004; Tribe 2004; Ateljevic, Pritchard & Morgan 2008; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

811 Jennings 2009, 685.

812 See also Jamal & Everett 2007, 60.

813 Caton 2014b, 186; see also Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Ayikoru 2009; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

814 Veijola 2007, xxi-xxii; see also Ateljevic et al. 2007; Jamal & Everett 2007, 60; Pritchard et al 2007; Dredge & Hales 2012; Veijola et al. 2014, 3-4.

tourism institutions and practices.⁸¹⁵ For instance, Jennings⁸¹⁶ and Belsky⁸¹⁷ have challenged today's tourism and hospitality researchers to re-examine the continued replication and dominance of Western-centric perspectives in travel and tourism and to develop research constructs based on inter- and cross-cultural, as well as non-Western, epistemologies and methodologies. The advocates of a critical turn in tourism studies, such as Ateljevic, Ren, Morgan and Pritchard, and also the authors of *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests*⁸¹⁸, have been calling for co-construction and co-creation of tourism knowledge. My research belongs to these lines of thinking, which focus on the participatory character of knowledge production.⁸¹⁹

Critical studies, which generally draw on the Frankfurt School, can be seen as efforts to move the research focus from 'what is' to 'what could be'.⁸²⁰ The critical studies go beyond conventional qualitative research and the post-modern goal to 'understand understanding' and view research as a possibility for emancipation and social change.⁸²¹ In order to challenge the culture of silence among politically marginalized group, the scholars of critical ethnography, critical tourism studies, critical pedagogy and critical indigenous research have often been inspired by Freire's writings on cultural consciousness.⁸²² These academic discussions question the authority of the academic researcher and call for active participation of those being studied; hence, conducting critically oriented research means asking the very same questions that should be posed to those in charge of development projects.⁸²³

Drawing from critical social theories and postcolonial approach necessarily includes the aim of challenging privilege and power.⁸²⁴ First of all,

815 Reynolds 1999 in Sharpley 2011, 86; see also Ateljevic et al 2008; Caton 2012; 2014; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

816 Jennings 2009, 685.

817 Belsky 2004.

818 Veijola et al. 2014.

819 Ibid.; Veijola 1997; 2007; Jamal & Everett 2007, 60; Tucker 2010; Dredge & Hales 2012.

820 Thomas 1993; Denzin 2001; Morrow & Torres, 2002; Noblit, Flores & Murillo 2004.

821 Thomas 1993, 4; Jordan & Yeomans 1995.

822 Morrow & Torres, 2002; Belsky 2004, 284; Humberstone 2004, 123; Jamal & Everett 2004; Tuhiwai Smith 2012; Chambers & Buzinde 2015, 3.

823 See also Jamal & Everett 2007, 61.

824 Young 2003, 7 in Tucker & Akama 2009, 505.

this means recognizing the impossibility of bracketing the researcher out from the research process. Replacing positivist and post-positivist research criteria means a readiness to ask: Who can be the knower? What 'truth' test must beliefs pass to be legitimated as knowledge? What kinds of things can be known and what counts as valid knowledge? and What is the relationship of the knower to the known?⁸²⁵ These are questions that asked by indigenous methodologies in particular, which approach cultural protocols, values and behaviours as an integral part of methodology.⁸²⁶ For instance, Tuhiwai Smith⁸²⁷ demands that researchers should have answers to answer the following kinds of questions: 'Whose research is it? Who owns it? Whose interests does it serve? Who will benefit from it? Who has designed the questions and framed its scope? and How will the results be disseminated?'

Jim Thomas⁸²⁸ defines critical ethnography simply as 'conventional ethnography with a political purpose'. According to him, the explicit goal of critical ethnography is emancipation. While ethnography as methodology continues to carry its earlier stamps of Orientalism and masculinism, critical ethnographers have simultaneously succeeded in adapting and adopting ethnography as a critique of the way in which knowledge is traditionally produced and communicated among social sciences.⁸²⁹ As a response to asymmetrical relations of power in academic research, critical ethnographers begin research with the ethical imperatives to challenge disempowering forms of social reproduction.⁸³⁰ During the last three decades critical ethnographers have followed not only Freire's, but also Gramsci's writings on treating social relations as opportunities for pedagogical encounters with those they research.⁸³¹ Critical ethnographers,

825 Harding 1987; Skeggs 1994, 77 in Humberstone 2004, 123.

826 Jennings 2009, 683-4; Tuhiwai-Smith 2012. For discussion about the interconnections between postcolonialist approaches and participatory action research, see, for instance Parsons & Harding (2011) who claim that both postcolonial theory and action research calls for justice by challenging the superiority of dominant perspectives and seeking to re-position and empower the marginalized and subordinated.

827 2012, 10; See also Denzin et al. 2008.

828 Thomas 1993.

829 Comaroff & Comaroff 1992, 7 in Vrasti 2008, 294; Vrasti 2010, 79.

830 Hytten 2004, 97.

831 Jordan & Yeomans 1995; Caton & Santos 2009.

as Hytten⁸³² explains it, claim that the central point of research is to develop forms of critical consciousness, in both researcher and researched. In order to do this, critical ethnographers connect the local research context to to the broader discourses of history, politics, economics and power.⁸³³ In simple terms, the hope has been expressed that, among other things, critical ethnography can alter marginalized people's consciousness.⁸³⁴ In Kincheloe and McLaren's⁸³⁵ words it could mean that the 'the source of this emancipatory action involves the researcher's ability to expose the contradictions of the world of appearances accepted by the dominant culture as natural and inviolable'.

The demand and possibilities of promoting social change through academic research have encouraged scholars to combine critical ethnography with participatory action research. Jordan and Yeomans⁸³⁶ argue the ways in which participatory action research emphasizes the importance of the research subjects as active actors in the research process, helps to avoid privileging the skills, experiences, or institutional status of an ethnographic researcher. Haanpää, Hakkarainen and García Rosell⁸³⁷ continue this argument, showing how combining critical ethnography and action research challenges, not only the traditional role of a researcher, but also the conceptualization of time and space in a field study. What is more, the changes are expected to take place beyond the lecture halls, in the field work context. In action research, the research process as such is usually considered as important as the outcomes of the study.⁸³⁸ In such research the researcher's role is to work primarily as a facilitator, while the goals and means of the process are defined together with all the participants.⁸³⁹ This means moving radically from data-mining research towards research agendas that better reflect

832 Hytten 2004, 97; see also Caton (2014b) on 'Making Messes with Constructivism and Critical Theory'.

833 Ibid.

834 Ibid., 98.

835 2000, p. 292 in Hytten 2004, 98.

836 1995, 402.

837 Haanpää et al. 2014.

838 see Lyckes & Coquillon 2007.

839 McIntyre 2008; Tuhiwai-Smith 2012; Haanpää et al. 2014.

the balanced interests of different partners.⁸⁴⁰ While critical ethnography is sometimes described as part of participatory action research, Haanpää et al.⁸⁴¹ point out that ethnographers rarely invite the subjects to produce, collect or analyse data in the same way as action researchers do.

Participatory action research is, without doubt, the most suitable and ethically sound research methodology inside the participatory paradigm.⁸⁴² At the same time, it should be remembered that the alternative, emancipatory, participatory and critical research methodologies and methods do not automatically alter and mobilize the traditional settings between the researchers and the researched. Regardless of the methodologies chosen, conducting research in economically less developed areas, for example, still involves relatively privileged Western researchers travelling to the countries in the Global South to study people living in poverty.⁸⁴³ And, as I have observed during my field work in Nicaragua, the settings are often similar when the researcher arrives from the wealthier cores in the Global South. Those engaged in critical examination of critical ethnography, such as Hytten⁸⁴⁴, Madison⁸⁴⁵, Jordan and Yeomans⁸⁴⁶, have pointed out how academic research still often means researchers coming down from their ivory towers in order to give a voice to the silenced and oppressed. They argue that although critical ethnography is presented as a 'bottom-up' approach, the priorities and interests of the academic audience still tend to come before the needs and interests of the local communities.⁸⁴⁷ What is more, even the emancipatory intentions 'to give a voice' to local communities can easily turn into smoothing out the collected information in totalizing theories.⁸⁴⁸

For these reasons it is vital to ask, likewise in the case of participatory and emancipatory development projects, whether 'the subaltern can speak'

840 See Baumgartner et al. 2004, 208.

841 Haanpää et al. 2014, 195, drawing on Foley & Valenzuela 2005.

842 See for instance Hytten 2004; Madison 2004; Tuhiwai-Smith 2012.

843 Hytten 2004, 99; Scheyvens & Storey 2003, 2.

844 Ibid.

845 Madison 2012.

846 Jordan & Yeomans 1995, 400.

847 Ibid., 404; Hytten 2004 99-100.

848 Turnbull 1991, 572 in Nygren 1999, 282-3; Madison 2004; see also Chambers & Buzinde 2015, 3.

in *my* research, or is my study just another way of silencing the other.⁸⁴⁹ This question cannot be answered by simply choosing ‘correct’ methods for studying the other. Instead, the other *can* be silenced even in pre-planned participatory action research when the researcher’s interests, research agenda, pre-assumptions and skills limit the possibilities and focus of the action. If this is the case, the research process might mainly strengthen the subjectivity of the mobile researcher. Importantly, despite the reflective and critical turns in ethnography, or in tourism studies in general, it has remained relevant to discuss what kinds of subject positions might be constructed in our research encounters.

It is clear that my own vision of an ethical methodological approach has drastically changed throughout the research process. As I will explain in the following section, the change has happened most of all through various encounters at Nicaraguan coffee tables, where I have got a chance to reflect on my role as a researcher, guest, tourist, young woman and so on. Valuing highly the Levinasian⁸⁵⁰ idea of intersubjectivity and Spivak’s⁸⁵¹ call for acknowledging one’s privileges and positionality in one’s relation with the other, I have noticed myself moving towards the thinking of dialogic critical ethnography or post-critical ethnography. Authors such as Jordan and Yeomans⁸⁵², Hytten⁸⁵³ and Madison⁸⁵⁴ and have defined the main themes of this ethnographic approach as: first, locating ethics in the centre of methodological considerations; second, demanding consciousness and accountability of one’s own assumptions and bias; and third, promoting openness and avoiding closed ends. These considerations can be seen as efforts to disrupt the persistent legacy of colonialism that even emancipatory research methodologies may sustain. I will keep returning to these debates more in detail as the journey goes on.

849 Spivak 1988, 283-4; 2000, 269-70; see also Chambers & Buzinde 2015, 4.

850 Levinas T&I 1969, 68-9; 304-6.

851 Spivak 1988, 272-4; Sharpe & Spivak 2002, 620.

852 Jordan & Yeomans 1995.

853 Hytten 2004.

854 Madison 2012

4.2 Strange encounters in ethnographic settings

The empirical case study of this research consists of policies and practices of Nicaraguan rural tourism development. To be clear, this case did not, and still does not, exist in the physical world, just waiting to be discovered and explored. Instead, as Vennesson⁸⁵⁵, Lund⁸⁵⁶, Dredge, Hales and Jamal⁸⁵⁷ highlight, the case emerged and was constructed by me as a researcher, and the strange encounters⁸⁵⁸ that have taken place in the fieldwork settings have been, at least to some extent, chosen and planned by me. For these reasons I must keep my eye on the personal, political and situated nature of the research process.⁸⁵⁹ Hence, I find it as my ethical duty to articulate and be reflective about my standpoints and roles as a researcher throughout the entire research process.⁸⁶⁰ And even after.

More specifically, this research draws on ethnographic research that I conducted between 2007–2013 in coffee-cultivating communities of San Ramón, as well as in air-conditioned offices and cafés in Matagalpa and Managua. During these years I visited and stayed in Nicaragua three different times – travelling between rural and urban areas. This meant, as Rantala⁸⁶¹ and Atkinson⁸⁶² would explain it, moving several times between physical, written and textual fields of ethnographic research. In the physical field, in Nicaragua, I collected data through semi-structural interviews and participant observation and by gathering official state documents, statistics, newspaper articles and tourism policies and strategies of institutions promoting rural tourism development in the country. In the following, I will describe in detail my experiences of being in the field, gathering the data and

855 Vennesson 2008.

856 Lund 2014.

857 Dredge et al. 2013, 32–3.

858 The formulation of this title has been inspired by Sara Ahmed's (2000) *Strange Encounters. Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*.

859 Tribe 2001.

860 Ateljevic 2007; Rantala 2011; Dredge et al. 2013. Caton 2013.

861 Rantala 2011b, 153–6; See also Caton (2013, 346) on epistemic encounters 'before', 'now' and 'after'.

862 Atkinson 1992.

modifying my research and interview questions along the way. Returning to these experiences has been possible through the hundreds of pages of field notes which have included reflections on my own understandings, confusions, and processes of learning and unlearning, throughout the journey.⁸⁶³

During my first stay in Nicaragua, in 2007-2008, I first worked nine months at the Embassy of Finland with international development cooperation, and then dedicated six months to writing and collecting data for my master's thesis. While in 2011-2012 I had a chance to be in the fieldwork in Nicaragua for four months, the last field visit, in 2013, lasted only the month of May. In addition to many informal discussions, which I have recorded in my field-work diary, the data from 2007 to 2013 consist of fifty-five semi-structured interviews. In order to give a general picture of these interviews, I want to note that thirty-eight of them (nine of these were group interviews) took place in the area of San Ramón, while seventeen of them were expert interviews conducted in Managua and Matagalpa. Although sixteen people from San Ramón were interviewed two or three times, there was a total of sixty-nine different interlocutors who kindly participated in my study. Forty-five of them were women and twenty-four were men. I conducted all the interviews in Spanish. All but six of them were recorded and later transcribed. In the analysis I will refer to the direct quotes from the recorded interviews with a code which indicates the year, the chronological order of the interview, and the gender of the respondent (e.g. 2012/23/M). The type and number of interviews are presented in more in detail in Appendix 2.

Before travelling to Nicaragua for the first time, I knew very little about the country's tourism sector. This was not a surprise as such, taking into consideration the combination of Eurocentrism in tourism studies and the relatively recent growth of tourist flows in Nicaragua. In any case, working with international development cooperation in Nicaragua, gave me a chance to follow the planning of rural tourism development in the country.⁸⁶⁴ I became interested in the discussions about the possibilities of rural community-based tourism in Nicaragua, and in Latin America in general.

863 Gadamer 1975 in Landgridge 2007, 123; Rantala 2011a, 48-50.

864 See Höckert 2009.

Some of the critiques were trying to decry this trend as ‘a misguided quest’ on the continent,⁸⁶⁵ arguing that this kind of tourism was more likely to cause dependency than empowerment and local control and that small scale tourism development included only a minimal possibility for economic growth.⁸⁶⁶ In short, it seemed to be a topic that divided opinions amongst those working with the issues related to rural development in the country.

When observing and listening to these debates, it began to bother me how tourism was repeatedly treated as one of the ‘productive’ rural sectors.⁸⁶⁷ This meant that the impacts of community-based tourism were mainly measured in economic terms, while the demand for sustainability translated to mitigation of possible environmental costs.⁸⁶⁸ Thus, as I described in the introductory chapter, believing in the emancipatory possibilities of this kind of tourism, I wanted to focus on the ‘people impacts’ and to find theoretical support for my assumption that the local context and local communities’ views should be better acknowledged in rural tourism debates.

I booked a meeting with development officials who were working with community-based tourism in Nicaragua and asked for their recommendations regarding a possible case study for my research. In my discussions with a tourism adviser from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), he suggested San Ramón as a good case for several reasons. In his opinion, San Ramón was one of the pioneers in community-based tourism in Nicaragua, the tourism initiative seemed to be well organized and coordinated there, and the communities had received different forms of support from many international development organizations. For instance, at that time UNDP’s Small Grant Program (SGP) was helping the local cooperative union in San Ramón to finance information signs and capacity building for the people participating in tourism development.⁸⁶⁹

Then, guided by the book *Guia de Turismo Rural en Nicaragua*, I took the first trip to San Ramón. I participated first on a coffee tour and learned

865 Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008.

866 Ibid., 102; PEMCE, 2008, 7; Pleumarom, 2002 cited Wild, 2008, 73; Rocha, 2008.

867 Höckert 2009.

868 See also Richter 2001, 289; Fennell & Przeclawski 2003, 144.

869 UCA San Ramón project document 2008

about the history of the coffee cooperatives, and then I asked the local guides and the local tourism coordinators whether I could return later on to collect material for my study. I presented myself as a junior researcher wanting to learn how tourism development was changing the lives of the local families and the life in the communities in general. And they said yes. However, although I was carrying with me the mantra of local participation in development, I did not connect this principle to the pre-requisites of ethical research. I had mainly read the more mainstream literature on community participation⁸⁷⁰ and must confess that I was not too concerned about these communities' expectations towards my study. Or perhaps I was just very sure that the interlocutors would be delighted at this opportunity to participate in an academic study, and to receive then the results from it. My assumptions were most probably strengthened by the impression that the study was somehow 'legitimized' by UNDP.⁸⁷¹

Before entering the field, I filled my backpack with literature on how to conduct ethnographic fieldwork. These books reminded me about the central ideas of ethnographic research, those that I had once learned in methodology courses, the 'seven steps of research': thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analysing, verifying and reporting.⁸⁷² I also revisited the instructions on how to plan semi-structured interviews with 'sequences of themes to be covered'⁸⁷³ and read how focusing on several cases could increase the depth of the study.⁸⁷⁴ These books reminded me about the things I should keep in mind while conducting ethnographic fieldwork, such as adequate time and openness, a respectful and ongoing relationship with the participants, and the importance of creating an atmosphere in which the interviews would feel safe to talk freely. These methodological guidebooks highlighted that I should allow the interlocutors to formulate their answers by expressing their own conceptions. Most importantly, con-

870 See for example.

871 That is, following Levinasian thought of hospitality, I was taking for granted the welcome of these communities.

872 Kvale, 1996.

873 Ibid., 124.

874 Hammersley & Atkinson 2007, 3, 18.

ducting interviews were promised to include a rare possibility to capture a multitude of views on a theme under scrutiny, that is, to picture a manifold and controversial human world.

During the bus-trip to San Ramón, I was nervous about the forthcoming interviews. While enjoying the scenery, I was dwelling in Mats Friberg's⁸⁷⁵ demand to distance oneself from one's cultural frameworks by proposing questions such as: 'How much of what I believe is nothing more than a package of ideas that I have unconsciously taken in from my own culture? To what extent am I prepared to regard the ideas and values of other groups as being equally valid as mine? Is it even possible to use ideas and norms which have been developed in my own culture and apply them to other groups?'. These were some of the main things I had written in my notebook, with a red marker, when I had studied development studies at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden. However, I should point out here that at that time I lacked other tools and thoughts that could have helped me to remember these questions, without falling too deeply into cultural relativism.

In September-October 2008 I lived four weeks with local families and collected field data for my study on the sociocultural meanings of tourism development. This time the fieldwork included a total of twenty-two interviews (#1-22) with women and men who were providing accommodation for tourists, young tourist guides, local experts in the issues of tourism and gender, and those who were not directly involved with tourism development. The guides helped me to contact potential interlocutors, I mainly conducted interviews in people's homes and the interviews lasted from fifteen minutes to one and half hour. While most of the interviews were held one-on-one with the participants, seven of them were held in groups. I gave up on my preliminary plans to conduct mainly group interviews after I came to doubt the ethicality and meaningfulness of squeezing people into group discussions where they did not feel themselves comfortable. In these interviews I asked open questions about the tourism programme, and about the changes it had brought about in the local communities. In addition to these questions, I used more specific questions to facilitate and support the

875 Friberg 1999, 148.

interviewing. I had broken them down into the categories such community and social capital, work, gender equality, new skills, self-esteem, cultural heritage, cultural exchange and values and behaviour.

In the course of my fieldwork, I helped women in the kitchen, took many photos, answered questions about my home country, rode a horse, helped to build an eco-cottage, played football, walked to school with children who were wearing their well-ironed white and blue uniforms, bought handi-crafts, played card games, picked coffee, learned about coffee production, and drank many litres of coffee with lots of milk and sugar. As is normal in ethnographic fieldwork settings, the discussions accompanying and alongside the interviews were a central part of the interaction⁸⁷⁶. In the middle of all this, I was imagining myself participating in people's daily lives as an ethnographic researcher. However, especially in tourism settings, this is an ambiguous position to have as I was guided by the tourist guides almost as a tourist and I was paying for the services according to their pricelist. Although I was holding tightly to my identity as a young researcher, the locals most likely received and perceived me like any of the travellers who arrive with many questions about gender equality, coffee cultivation, history and politics. In fact, many of their guests were going there to do different kinds of studies.⁸⁷⁷

Besides staying and living in San Ramón, I travelled there several times from my more permanent home in Managua. For instance, once it was a tourism consultant from LuxDevelopment who offered me a possibility to join her – as an observer – in a tourism evaluation visit in San Ramón. Another time a small group of tourism experts from UNDP, Rainforest Alliance and the travel book *Lonely Planet* welcomed me on a larger tour of community-based tourism projects, including a visit to San Ramón. On one occasion, I had a chance to follow the building of an eco-lodge in La Pita and to discuss with the representative of the financing organization called Ecotours. While the observations and informal discussions from these

876 Atkinson et al. 2001, 4-5.

877 The growing trend in volunteer tourism has brought new possibilities, even highly contradictory ones, to conduct research in exotic places, far away from home.

visits formed an important part of my first empirical data, I have occasionally regretted *why* I did not ask these tourism experts for semi-structured interviews. However, during my first stay in Nicaragua, my focus was not yet on the encounters between tourism experts and local hosts.

After returning from the field, I focused my qualitative content analysis on the social and cultural impacts from the locals' point of view. I concluded that in particular young tourist guides and the women responsible for the accommodation had gained new contacts, knowledge, skills and confidence through tourism development.⁸⁷⁸ However, while I was 'surprised' at the central role of the tourism developers, there were other things that I likewise should have noticed – and wondered about – during the analysis and reporting. For instance, I never really stopped thinking why some of the people, including the coordinators of the tourism programme, had been reluctant to participate in the study. I have only later realized how the desire to come up with clear and manageable results (read: normative) can only be fulfilled when neglecting or silencing some of the non-fitting experiences. I will come back to this in the next section (4.3), where I focus on the primary and secondary analyses of the data.

Moving the focus from rural communities towards development encounters

I wrote my master's thesis study in 2009 based on the first period of field work. Based on my analysis I argued that the real essence of rural community-based tourism could be seen in its potential to promote people's control over those factors that affect their daily lives.⁸⁷⁹ Then a few years later, in 2011, I returned to Nicaragua to continue my research. As I had promised the people in San Ramón, we put together a workshop in order to share the results of my previous study. This matter had come up when people commented on how researchers hardly ever returned after their fieldwork, although the locals would have been interested to know what these stud-

878 Höckert 2009.

879 Ibid..

ies were actually about.⁸⁸⁰ For me this workshop meant taking one, shaky step beyond conventional ethnographic research towards more critical and emancipatory ethnography.

While I was planning the workshop with the local tourism coordinators, I received helpful guidance from two professors from the *Sustainable tourism* programme at UNAN University in Managua.⁸⁸¹ My role in the actual workshop was to present the results of my previous study, and to facilitate the discussion between the representatives from different communities regarding the current state of tourism in San Ramón. While people seemed happy about the possibility to hear about my study, it was obvious that I was telling them something that they already knew; that is, it was obvious for them that tourism had had great importance, especially for women and young people, but that there had also been conflicts related to tourism. The reactions varied greatly. While some of the participants thanked me for reminding them about their accomplishments with tourism development, one of the guides brought up that he did not understand why had I actually made a study like this. The workshop situation also turned out more official than intended, most likely because one of the tourism experts from UNDP was ‘observing’ the meeting. This experience made me painfully aware about the ways in which internal power relations play a crucial role in the success and failure of community-engaging research methods.

For me the main message from the workshop was that the local hosts were no longer very motivated regarding the activities related to tourism development. They were disappointed with the lack of tourists, the lack of local coordination and the lack of transparency and open communication (#36). What is more, they seemed to be tired of the tourism experts coming and analysing them and the current ‘problems’. In my view, a concrete example of this was the way in which one of the guides, Oscar who had

880 I had not been the only one doing academic research on tourism development in the communities of San Ramón. Ever since, and even before, there have been other studies made on tourism development in these communities. One of the studies that has been published in academic journals, is the one by Zapata et al. 2011.

881 I am thankful to tourism professors Olga Comez and Flora Avedano for all their help in the process of preparing the workshop.

normally been very active in tourism activities, arrived to the workshop only when we were already closing up. It seemed like he had not been interested to listen to me talking about *his* tourism project; instead, *he* wanted to talk. After the workshop he came and talked to me about his frustration with the new rural tourism quality programme which, according to him, was not in any sense realistic for people living in his home community. He cursed the various demands for shower curtains, warm water and fire alarms, as these all were things that they could not afford. Neither did he see them as relevant to the rural lifestyle. He was outraged when he stated that ‘the tourism officials did not seem to understand what this kind of rural tourism is about’.

It is obvious that organizing the workshop, and encouraging the participants to discuss the current challenges, had made the ‘boundary’ between participatory action research and ethnographic fieldwork fuzzy.⁸⁸² When I afterward returned to one of the tourism communities in San Ramón, the local hosts wanted to share with me stories which indicated how tired they were of tourism experts and other visitors keen to tell them what to do. Time after another, I noticed me responding that they should not care about unconstructive critique of the local conditions. On another occasion I caught myself nodding enthusiastically when one of the guides planned to focus solely on national and domestic tourism in the future.

Before coming to Nicaragua for this second time, in 2012, I had studied and thought about the different possibilities of conducting participatory action research. I had become particularly interested in the potential of a methodology called Photovoice.⁸⁸³ However, after meeting the people and sensing their feelings of fatigue with projects in general, with constant flow of ‘new’ ideas and methodologies from outside, I changed my mind.⁸⁸⁴ The

882 For messiness of community case study research, see Caton 2013; Dredge et al 2013.

883 For Photovoice as a community-based participatory research, see Hergenrather, Rhodes & Bardhoshi 2010.

884 My experiences and decisions corresponds to Caton’s (2014) argument that the tension between constructivism and critical theory is pedagogical and care oriented. That is, in Caton’s (2013, 129) view the choice between different methodological and epistemological approaches have more to do with ‘the existence of different moral imaginaries about how people (in this case researchers are participants) can best do right by each other than with researcher’s basic beliefs about the nature of reality or the point of the research endeavor.

people living in the rural communities and accommodating tourists, and indebted because of tourism, were disillusioned by the uncertainty of tourism. However, the local coordinators who received a monthly salary from tourism were hoping that I could help them to acquire new development projects and financing. Few times they brought up the need for a study that could help them to market their products. None of this was anything that I was there for. Neither would I have even been capable of doing a marketing research after studying mainly cultural studies of tourism and development.⁸⁸⁵

In this situation, I was sure that proposing to the locals that I could come up with a suitable study project that would somehow fit in with my previous education and experiences would have been contradictory to the very idea of participatory action research. I felt that in this kind of situation I did not want to ask the locals to take part in participatory action research that I had planned. In fact, in this case it would have been an act of silencing local priorities, such as the need to improve marketing practices.⁸⁸⁶ It was also obvious that it would have been highly challenging to find a harmony between multiple and plural voices in order to be sure that the study addressed the local interests.⁸⁸⁷ In San Ramón it would have not been right for a guest from Finland to have started one more community-participation project in order to gain data and material for her dissertation. Neither would I have been ready to go through the hyper-self-reflective work that such complicated encounters would have required.⁸⁸⁸ At that moment I was also guided by Olivier de Sardan's⁸⁸⁹ warning that fusing the roles of social scientists and developers entails a risk of falling into the trap of poor research and misguided action.⁸⁹⁰

885 See Hyttne's (2004) and Jordan & Yeoman's (1995) discussions about the ethnographic researchers climbing down from their ivory towers.

886 For discussion on challenges of critical ethnography and participatory research, see Hytten 2004.

887 Nygren 1999; Dredge & Hales 2012; Dredge et al. 2013.

888 I want to thank especially Anja Nygren and Liina-Maija Quist for discussing this issue with me.

889 de Sardan 2005, 201-2.

890 see Hytten 2004.

This realization directed me to focus on the *encounters* between rural communities and us, the ‘tourism experts’ who arrive to help the locals to participate. I conducted what Gould and Marcussen⁸⁹¹, Alastalo and Åkerman⁸⁹² could describe as ‘expert interviews’ with tourism development officials who were involved in the planning and implementation of the new strategy for ‘sustainable rural tourism development’ in the country.⁸⁹³ The purpose of these interviews was to gain understanding about the meanings that the tourism experts give to rural tourism development and to their encounters with rural communities. In other words, I sought to understand how tourism officials interpreted the possible challenges of rural tourism development in Nicaragua, and what kind of support and help they wanted to provide to rural communities and enterprises.

The special character of these kinds of ‘expert interviews’ lies in the fact that there usually is only a limited number of potential informants.⁸⁹⁴ Luckily a representative of the Nicaraguan tourism ministry INTUR welcomed me to their ‘roundtable for sustainable tourism development’ – in a role of an observer. The purpose of these roundtable – meetings were to enhance dialogue between public servants and consultants from the ministry, functionaries of international development agencies, and representatives of the private sector. This kind of invitation helped me to create new contacts with possible informants. Hence, in addition to many informal discussions with tourism experts, I was able to conduct all together thirteen expert interviews (#23-35) during my stay in 2012. The informants included four representatives of rural tourism development in INTUR; the director of the chamber for small tourism enterprises CANATUR; a specialist on the tourism exportation sector in ProNicaragua; and the founder and director of rural community-based tourism network RENITURAL. The tourism experts and consultants of international development agencies represented the following organizations: Swisscontact, Spanish Agency for Cooperation AECID,

891 Gould & Marcussen 2004.

892 Alastalo & Åkerman 2010.

893 INTUR (2010b) *Política y Estrategia de Turismo Rural Sostenible. Fincas Agroturisticas de Nicaragua.* ; see also INTUR 2009a; 2012a.

894 Alastalo & Åkerman 2010, 374.

Netherlands Development Organization SNV, United Nations World Tourism Organization UNWTO, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, United Kingdom's Department for International Development DFID, and the United Nations Development Programme UNDP (SGP Small Grants Programme).⁸⁹⁵ In addition to these interviews, I would like to acknowledge the importance of the more unofficial discussions with representatives from Alba Sud, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Luxemburg's Agency for Development cooperation (LuxDev). Also teachers and professors from the tourism departments in UCA and UNAN Universities encouraged and guided me to acquire relevant information about rural tourism development in the country.

While planning the structure of the expert interviews, I tried to formulate questions that would encourage the participants to reflect on the topic from their own point of view.⁸⁹⁶ I acknowledged that this would perhaps be the only way of receiving information beyond that in the official policy and programme documents – especially when interviewing tourism officials in the Nicaraguan tourism ministry. I limited the main themes of the semi-structured interviews to questions such as 'What kind of tourism development do different organizations support and why? What are the possibilities and challenges of rural tourism development in Nicaragua? What kind of support might rural communities need in order to develop tourism? and Why are social projects needed in rural tourism development?'

It is also relevant to mention that I was collecting the research data and studying it – or made a preliminary analysis – somewhat simultaneously.⁸⁹⁷ This is typical in the case of expert interviews; Koskinen, Alasuutari and Peltonen⁸⁹⁸ describe this as 'doing one's homework' which results in a tailored structure for each interview session. This 'homework' was necessary since the interview situations included various challenges related to power,

895 All these development agencies were supporting rural tourism development through projects such as Ruta del Café, Ruta de Volcanoes, Ruta del Caribe, Promipyme and ProPemce.

896 Alastalo & Åkerman 2010, 389.

897 Ibid., 373.

898 Koskinen et al. 2005, 117–120 in Alastalo & Åkerman 2010; For more critical conceptualization of 'homework', see Kuokkanen 2007, and the Sections 3.5 and 6.3 in this study.

knowledge, 'personal chemistries', language and trust. Even though I had approached the participants by describing what my position and purposes were as researcher, people had interpreted the purpose of the meeting in several ways. While some of the Nicaraguan authorities and representatives of NGOs received me as a member of the international development cooperation community, once I was welcomed even as a potential investor. In general it can be said that the international donors spoke to me more openly than the representatives of the tourism ministry and export sector.⁸⁹⁹

For a Finnish researcher the timing of this field visit was simultaneously interesting and difficult as during these months the foreign ministry of Finland announced its plans to leave Nicaragua after 30 years of bilateral development cooperation. In February 2012, it was somewhat peculiar to conduct interviews in the Nicaraguan tourism ministry INTUR, when the interviewees had the morning newspaper on their desk speculating on the state of the Nicaragua-Finland relations and on broken promises. It is clear that my encounters with the Nicaraguan tourism officials were shaped by the situation in which Finland and other Nordic countries openly announced their disappointment with the Sandinista government then in power. Returning later to these experiences through my fieldwork diary helped me to reflect on how the changed atmosphere and the changed tone in the words of welcome, had been shaking and shaping my own subjectivity as a researcher.

Searching for hospitable encounters

I made the last field visit to the coffee-growing hillsides of San Ramón in May 2013. After the previous stay, I had had more than a year to read and search for understanding as to why the people in San Ramón to be so tired of tourism projects. There was this one story in particular about a badly behaved consultant which stayed with, if not almost haunted, me. It was a story that doña Hilda had told me about a visit by a specialist from a tour-

⁸⁹⁹ During the interviews I acknowledged tacitly that the participants had the power as they had the information that interested me.

ism programme called Moderniza. I will get back to this incident in detail in Chapter 6, but I would hasten to point out that the story had made me confused and troubled about the incapability of the tourism experts to listen to the local hosts. I had come to notice that my previous conceptualizations of ‘situated knowledge’ or ‘local knowledge’ and ‘inclusion and exclusion’ were no longer helping me. Above all, they were not helping me to envision any alternatives to the current settings.

In February 2013, a few months before my field-visit, I had a unique chance to participate in an academic camping experience at a log house in Finnish Lapland. The texts and articles we discussed during this one week experiment inspired us to *imagine tourism post-biopolitically*. This task challenged us to discuss about different ways of disrupting the tourism that is dictated by neoliberalism; that is, which ‘extends market rationality across the entire social field into the deepest crevices of individuality’.⁹⁰⁰ Preparing for this experiment helped me, peculiarly as a tourism student, to rediscover the concepts of hospitality and welcome and to explore the possibilities of exploring and envisioning alternative ways of being through these concepts.⁹⁰¹ The inspiring discussions during the camp with Soile Veijola, Jennie Germann-Molz, Alexander Grit, Gavin Urie and Tim Edensor then encouraged me to approach the encounters between hosts and guests in rural tourism development through Levinas’ and Derrida’s discussions on hospitality. In fact, the camping experience continued long after the actual stay in the log house in Lapland as we went on to write together the book on ‘untidy guests’ (see Section 1.3).⁹⁰²

Thus, the last time I travelled to San Ramón in May 2013, I had different readings in my backpack. Instead of reading *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*⁹⁰³, I took the bus to San Ramón, with writings by Levinas, Derrida

900 Vraști 2013, 32 in Veijola et al. 2014, 9.

901 I want to thank Soile Veijola and Suvi Alt for kindly recommending me this concept before I had realized its potential by myself.

902 Olli Pyyhtinen – one of the authors of ‘Disruptive tourism and its Untidy Guests’ – was present in the camp through his book manuscript *The Gift and Its paradoxes: Beyond Mauss* (published in 2014) which was read by Soile Veijola during the camp.

903 Hammersley & Atkinson 2007.

and Spivak in my hand.⁹⁰⁴ I felt that Levinas⁹⁰⁵ idea of ‘subjectivity as welcoming the Other’ – an idea that calls for attention to the ways in which we welcome each other – was now helping me to understand why the encounters in rural tourism were sometimes perceived as quite unethical. This means that I began to weave together the empirical data from San Ramón with the theoretical discussions on ethical subjectivities already before and during the visit. These authors, and the support and inspiration from the camper community in Lapland, helped me to return with more curiosity, and less fear of somehow failing. My recent readings had encouraged me to understand that failure can be seen as success in a sense that it is a sign of a more open mind.⁹⁰⁶ This was definitely a positive development as during the last field visit, in 2012, I experienced a great deal of frustration and confusion about the ways in which the local hosts had disillusioned with the so called participatory tourism projects.

Then, shortly after I had arrived in Nicaragua for the third time, I visited a local university in Matagalpa and met young students who were writing their thesis on tourism development in San Ramón for their university degree. The students, likewise their teachers, were eager to share their experiences from their field visits with me, because they had not been able to collect data as they had expected. The students had received no more than a lukewarm welcome from the locals, and even otherwise active members of the community had tried to avoid being interviewed. The students could not understand why the locals did not want to receive them. I had my guesses that their eagerness to to organize capacity building sessions for the locals, on one hand, and the fact that they had not paid anything for their food or accommodation, on the other, might have played some role.

While the local coordinators at UCA San Ramón had been somewhat uninterested to welcome me, which was for me simultaneously an illuminating but difficult situation, the local families had always welcomed me

904 In the book on *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests*, I make a fictional trip with these authors to the highlands of Nicaragua (Höckert 2014). I do this by drawing inspiration from Veijola & Jokinen’s charter trip to Mallorca in 1994.

905 Levinas T&I 1969, 27.

906 Kapoor 2004; Höckert 2014.

warmly. However, I imagine that the fact that I do have always paid a fair price for their services has made a difference. As I mentioned earlier, the families had most likely received me as a tourist with questions, not as a tourism developer bent on telling them how they should act and how they should receive guests in their homes. I have, of course, always told them about my ongoing research on rural tourism development.

Especially after realizing the beauty of the ‘welcome of the other’, I was happy that the hosts welcomed me. For whatever reason, this time the interlocutors gave me fascinating answers – without me really even posing specific questions. I suggest that one of the key factors here was that I did not arrive with a set agenda and plan. I carried out 15 open interviews in the communities of San Ramón (#39-53). Many of the interlocutors were the same people that I had interviewed in 2008 and who then had also participated in the workshop in 2012. I asked open questions about the current situation with regard to tourism development, about the plans for the future, and so on. Furthermore, I asked again about possibly negative experiences with visitors. In addition to doing the fieldwork in the communities of San Ramón, I interviewed tourism experts from Swisscontact (#37), INTUR (#39, 54), and LuxDev (#55) and had more unofficial discussions with the professors from UNAN in Managua and Matagalpa as well as two tour operators in Matagalpa.

The fieldwork diary⁹⁰⁷ that I wrote during this visit, later functioned as a good reminder of the challenges of keeping one’s mind open. The notes include a whole range of feelings spanning worry about the current coffee crisis⁹⁰⁸, worry about my own research process, frustration and anger towards tourism experts or travel agencies (see Chapter 7), and variations of happiness and annoyance towards the curious children who entered my tourist hut and wanted to use my laptop. Reading and re-reading field notes have helped me to understand why Quetzil Castañeda⁹⁰⁹ wishes to distinguish the processes of ‘being in fieldwork’ and ‘gathering data’. What Castañeda underlines is the

907 Cerwonka & Malkki 2007; Langdrige 2007, 123.

908 For more information about La Roya coffee fungus in 2013 in Central America, see for example Olam 2013; Terazono, E. 2013.

909 Castañeda 2006.

holistic nature of ethnographic fieldwork, that is, how focusing only on the concrete actions of gathering data causes a researcher to neglect her or his experiences and reflections when, for instance, she or he does not succeed in getting desired or expected data. In other words, *being* in fieldwork embraces the pre-assumptions, disappointments, and ‘failures’ as part of the data.⁹¹⁰

4.3 Hermeneutic phenomenological analysis

The almost seven-year period was not a continuous, long stretch of fieldwork. Instead it can be described as longitudinal ethnography which continued even when I was not in the ‘field’.⁹¹¹ Rantala⁹¹² depicts a three-layered ethnographic process as moving between physical, written and textual fields. In my study it means that although I was no longer present in the physical encounters with the informants, I continued to encounter my data and the literature that helped me to analyse this data. As a result, my research journey included many flights and bus rides, various kinds of travel literature and different types of questions. Especially the drastic change in my travel readings indicates the impossibility of separating theory and practice; instead of making long leaps between empirical and theoretical worlds, the leaps became constant and messy. This meant changes in the theoretical and operationalized concepts that I was using to make sense of the studied world. While some concepts turned out to be more limiting, others, such as ‘hospitality’, suddenly opened new doors. In Cerwonka and Malkki’s⁹¹³ words, I was ‘improvising theory’ along the way. Hence, I agree with them and others that the essence of ethnography is the very openness of the travelogue written during and after the journey.⁹¹⁴

The first and the last bus trip to the communities of San Ramón were clearly very different. While the first time I was convinced of the need to

910 See also Vrasti 2013; Wilson & Hollinshead 2015.

911 For discussion about the length of a field work, see Haanpää et al. 2014; Fetterman 1998, 10.

912 Rantala 2011b, 153–5.

913 Cerwonka & Malkki 2007.

914 Ateljevich et al. 2007; Cerwonka 2007; Rantala 2011b; Veijola, no date; Vrasti 2013.

analyse the social and cultural impacts of tourism development, the last time I was mainly wondering why had I actually been so sure about it. Likewise I reflected on why I had overlooked the consequences of these kinds of research visits from my earlier analysis. In this sense, my recently gained insights about the Levinasian⁹¹⁵ notion of *welcome*, had certainly interrupted my own spontaneous freedom to visit and study the ‘other’. It had made me realize my own position as a cosmopolitan traveller and researcher who had previously taken for granted the welcome *of* the other – that the other welcomes me. Most of all, this approach encouraged me to reflect on the meanings that I was implicitly giving to my own encounters with ‘my’ informants.

When moving from Levinasian deliberations towards methodological discussions means going beyond Levinas’ own texts, the phenomenological method can help to imagine and describe what ‘Levinasian thinking’ might look like.⁹¹⁶ Levinas’ commentator Drabinski argues that Levinas’ relationship to discussions of the phenomenological methodology is so manifold and complicated that it is a matter for an independent study and debate. Those engaged in this debate emphasize Levinas’ interpretation of Edmund Husserl’s description of intentionality as the ground of method.⁹¹⁷ Drabinski⁹¹⁸ explains that Levinas begins where Husserl always begins: ‘in the irreducible relationality of intentionality’, and argues then that the intentional analysis means searching for the concrete. For Husserl, every consciousness is a consciousness of something; for this reason we cannot think of subjectivity without the formation of a subject relation.⁹¹⁹ This is, in fact, the insight that phenomenology begins with.

However, Levinas, together with Heidegger, was critical of Husserl’s turn to phenomenology and transcendental reduction as the condition of philosophy and philosophizing self.⁹²⁰ It is this critique that in the

915 For Levinas’ thought on welcome as interruption of self, see T&I, 1969, 82-4.

916 Drabinski 2013, 21.

917 Ibid., 20, 24, 29; see also Edelheim 2007.

918 Ibid. 24.

919 Ibid.; see also 2010, 1061-5.

920 Ibid., 31

long run led to a crucial division inside the methodological discussions of phenomenology. While there are many ways to group and categorize the methodological traditions in phenomenology, the clearest division exists between those who follow and draw on Husserl's or on Heidegger's school of phenomenology. Husserl's phenomenological tradition is seen as a positivist one, followed by post-positivist thinker Merleau-Ponty, in which the pre-conceptions are bracketed away. By contrast, Heidegger's interpretivist approach, later developed further by Gadamer and van Manen, defines the experiencing subject as something that *cannot* be taken out of the picture.⁹²¹

As Levinasian⁹²² ethical phenomenology lacks methodological instructions on how to welcome the other, I have chosen to draw inspiration from Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenological approach. Different from Husserl's phenomenology, Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology does not claim to develop accurate descriptions but focuses instead on the 'situated, dialogic and interpretive qualities of being'.⁹²³ This tradition, or orientation, acknowledges that there are always pre-conceptualizations and pre-suppositions about the phenomenon under scrutiny and encourages self-reflectivity about them. Heidegger criticized Husserl's positivist idea of phenomenologists being able to experience incidents 'afresh' or 'from nowhere', by arguing that people are always surrounded by a *historicity* that shapes experiences in their own time in specific ways.⁹²⁴ Pernecky and Jamal⁹²⁵ describe how the notion of historicity is pertinent to Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology and a key aspect of the *hermeneutic circle*. Or as Edelheim⁹²⁶ puts it, for Heidegger⁹²⁷ the hermeneutic circle helped to clarify the historic and contextual settings that shape our experiences.

921 Ibid., 1061-5. Gadamer 1975; van Manen 1990.

922 For the notion of 'ethical phenomenology', see Edelheim 2007.

923 Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1064-5

924 Heidegger 1962, 174 in Edelheim 2007, 51.

925 Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1065; for hermeneutic circle, see also Caton & Santos 2008.

926 Edelheim 2007, 62.

927 Heidegger 1962.

Hermeneutic phenomenology questions, as post-modern ethnography does, the dichotomies between subjects and objects, body and mind, self and other. Hence, as Veijola and Valtonen⁹²⁸ point out, the phenomenological body is not an object. Instead, it ‘situates the human body in a network of relationships and practices, thus facilitating an embodied view of experiences rather than dualist disembodied ones’.⁹²⁹ Hence, applying a hermeneutic phenomenological approach means doubting and questioning the possibility of a subjective experience.⁹³⁰ This in turn means addressing the intersubjective character of an experience by focusing, for instance, in social meanings and understandings contained in language.⁹³¹ In this approach, pre-suppositions and prejudices are simply conditions whereby we experience something; in other words, pre-understandings can be seen as biases stemming from our openness to the world.⁹³² It is these relational and self-critical attitudes that, according to Jamal and Hollinshead⁹³³, make interpretivist phenomenological studies more reliable than those which hide prejudices and biases behind the value of objectivity.

Gadamer⁹³⁴ and van Manen⁹³⁵, who have adhered to Heidegger’s approach towards hermeneutic phenomenological analysis underline how the two methodologies should be seen not as a simple models of exercise, but as a heuristic guides to practice.⁹³⁶ While Gadamer⁹³⁷ operationalizes phenomenological philosophy, he simultaneously warns about providing rules for analysis which could prematurely foreclose possible ways of understanding. Instead, he calls for creative engagement of the method.

928 Veijola & Valtonen 2007, 18.

929 Pernecky & Jamal, 2010, 1059.

930 Hermeneutic phenomenological approach, just like postcolonial ones, encourages to doubt, not only the others, but also self. See also Cartesian meditations, Descartes method of doubt

931 Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1058.

932 Gadamer 1975; See also Edelheim 2007, 63 and his discussion with D. Moran, 2000, 278; see also Caton & Santos 2008.

933 Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Edelheim 2007, 89; Jirón 2011, 36; Caton 2013.

934 Gadamer 1975.

935 van Manen 1990.

936 van Manen 1990, Cerwonka 2007, 22-3; Edelheim 2007; Pernecky & Jamal 2010.

937 Gadamer 1975; For more interpretations on Gadamer’s discussions of hermeneutic phenomenology, see Langdrige 2007, 122; Cervonka 2007, 22.

In essence, this approach encourages becoming open to – and surprised by – different experiences, understandings and meanings that people give to the phenomenon under the scrutiny.⁹³⁸

In Pernecky and Jamal's⁹³⁹ view, hermeneutic phenomenology provides researchers with an opportunity to explore how meaningful experiences come about. As a starting point for a study, van Manen⁹⁴⁰ asks researchers to turn to a phenomenon which seriously interests us and commits us to the world. Most of the phenomenological studies in tourism research focus on exploring the *tourists'* experiences, which tells us something about the field of study as such. This trend was begun by Erik Cohen's *Phenomenology of Tourist Experience* published in 1979. What is more, Cohen's study started a tradition of research on tourists' experiences which tends to neglect the theoretical underpinnings of the phenomenological tradition.⁹⁴¹ Generally speaking it seems like the 'phenomenological' studies of tourism have maintained the subjective-objective divide between the subject who experiences and the object that is being experienced.⁹⁴² These objects have been everything that the guests might gaze at and experience – even people.⁹⁴³ This is to say that although phenomenology questions the very basic idea of the individual subject, the celebration of that subject continues even in supposedly phenomenological studies. Hence, there exists a need to overcome the "habitual methodological individualism of tourist studies as well as teleological, detached, all-powerful conceptions of the subject".⁹⁴⁴

In the present study I analyse the ways in which different actors expe-

938 For further discussion on the importance of Gadamer's "philosophical hermeneutics" in tourism research, and in understanding our positions as knowing subjects in general, see Caton' (2013) 'The Risky Buisness of Understanding: Philosophical hermeneutics and the knowing subject in worldmaking'.

939 Pernecky and Jamal 2010, 1063.

940 van Manen 1990. 64-5; see also Langdrigde 2007.

941 see Pernecky & Jamal 2010., 1057; For discussions of phenomenology in tourism, see also Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Edelheim 2007; Caton & Santos 2008; Ablett & Dyer 2009.

942 For exceptions, see Edelheim (2015) *Tourist Attractions: From Objective to Narrative*.

943 Hence it seems like not only tourism marketing, but also tourism research has contributed in the tendency of objectifying the 'other' in tourism settings. For me this is paradoxical as tourism scholars simultaneously share a concern about the objectifying, for instance, indigenous communities as part of the tourist attractions.

944 Pons 2003, 43 in Pernency & Jamal 2010, 1058; Sharp 1982, in Jordan & Yeomans 1995, 396.

rience, understand, interpret and give meanings to tourism development encounters. Hence the phenomenon that I am interested in is not tourism as such but the encounters that take place in the context of tourism development. This limitation is guided by hermeneutic phenomenology, which encourages looking at the relations between actors, in the present case focusing on the relationship between self and the other. Therefore, the unit of analysis in interpretivist phenomenological studies is the relationship between a situation and the people involved. This means focusing not on individuals, communities, or ethnic groups as such, but on the meanings, understandings and interpretations that different actors give to their lived experiences.⁹⁴⁵

The aim of my analysis is to describe tourism development encounters from different standpoints: people who are engaged in tourism in their home communities, tourism developers, students, researchers and teachers. Some perceptions from the tourists' side are included. This means that the approaches change according to the actor whose experiences I am interpreting and describing. The primary data of the analysis are the words from people that I interviewed during my field visits and the thoughts that I have gathered in my own fieldwork diaries. Needless to say, all these sources provide an abundance of data.

I conducted and transcribed fifty-five semi-structured interviews with the aim of making a more 'conventional' ethnographic analysis of it; not a hermeneutic phenomenological one. However, in hermeneutic phenomenological analysis, the number of informants, or the amount of data, are rarely seen as relevant. In Edelheim's⁹⁴⁶ research on phenomenological experience and cultural critique of tourism studies, his analysis focuses on one person's experiences and this person is Edelheim himself. Edelheim refers to Seamon's⁹⁴⁷ suggestion that practicing phenomenologists reach their moment of insight when having an 'aha' or 'eureka' experience. This has also been described as the 'phenomenological nod'.⁹⁴⁸ In my study I have

945 Cerwonka & Malkki 2008, 75; Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1056.

946 Edelheim 2007.

947 Seamon 2002 in Edelheim 2007, 52.

948 van Manen 1990, 26 in Edelheim 2007, 52.

sought to remain 'loyal' to my own experiences of this phenomenological nod by laying special emphasis on the data that helped me to experience the 'aha'.

Following van Manen's proposal, I began the analysis by searching for articulations of experiences through methods of *holistic reading* and *selective reading*. While holistic reading meant reading and searching for the main significance of the transcribed text as a whole, selective reading included locating expressions which seemed particularly essential or revealing about the phenomenon. These kinds of statements were related especially to the issues of teaching, showing, guiding, learning, receiving, giving, sharing, participating and so on. In summary, the main questions that I asked during the ongoing dialogue with my data were: How do different actors experience and interpret tourism development encounters? What kinds of meanings do they give to these meetings⁹⁴⁹?, How different actors understand their own roles in tourism development? What experiences are, and are not, shared between the participants? and How might previous encounters might shape the current ones? In other words, the last question meant asking in what kinds of historical, material, political and social contexts the encounters take place.

In order to answer the last question, I enriched the analysis with data from Nicaraguan artists' and authors'. So in the process of reading and analysing the data, I was looking for expressions which described feelings, values and experiences related to the tourism development encounters. I also followed van Manen's recommendation to focus on particular incidents and examples of the experience which stand out for their vividness.⁹⁵⁰ At the same time I aimed to balance the research context by considering its parts and the whole. Instead of claiming that I knew the data and understood it, I wanted to be able to stop, wonder and allow myself to be surprised by what did not fit in with that I had imagined about the phenomenon. Van Manen⁹⁵¹ describes

949 'Although I ask "What kinds of meanings different actors give to these encounters", this is not semiotics.

950 van Manen 1990, 65, 85.

951 Ibid., 79 in Langdrige 2007, 123, What happens with the pre-assumptions here?

this process as bringing our full attention to the material at hand and having a desire for understanding and engaging in ‘the free act of seeing.

Following Gadamer’s advice, I moved with the analysis in a circular fashion; I understand the hermeneutic circle as a circle of constantly forming imaginings with no clear beginning or end. In hermeneutic phenomenology the analysis process is guided by the relationship and encounters between the researcher and the data, as if the researcher is having a dialogue with the text and co-constructing the meanings in collaboration with the data.⁹⁵² All in all, analysis means imagining what expressions about experiences might mean. Hence, the hermeneutic circle is based on the assumption that no experience can make sense without a certain pre-understanding and initial knowledge of the context it is presented in.⁹⁵³

I find the hermeneutic circle liberating and forgiving as it builds on the thought that pre-understandings, prejudices, pre-suppositions, fore-conceptions and imaginings are shaped by accounts of previous experiences. For instance, as I was making the second analysis of the data which I had collected initially for my master’s thesis (#1-22), I noticed many things that I had succeeded in missing in my previous analysis. It was an eye-opening experience to notice the expressions that I earlier neglected. It seems, as odd as it may sound, that I had not ‘heard’ some of the things in an interview, when I transcribed the data or when I did the analysis. This is where the hermeneutic circle serves a need: it allows the continuity of analysis and the disruption of previous forms of silencing. The circle is also a constant reminder that the purpose of phenomenology is ‘not to provide variable results in a positivist sense, but to add a viewpoint of the issue under investigation’.⁹⁵⁴

952 Cerwonka 2007, 23; Grenz 1996 in Langdridge 2007, 123.

953 D. Moran 2000 in Edelheim 2007, 86.

954 Suvantola 1999, 12 in Edelheim 2007, 87; see also Caton & Santos 2008.

4.4 Epistemic violence of representation

Despite the unfinishedness and openness of hermeneutic phenomenological analysis, the focal phenomenon must be temporarily frozen if it is to be described.⁹⁵⁵ That is, inviting the reader to participate in the discussions about the phenomenon at hand requires representing the experiences of the phenomenon in some kind of context, painting a picture while the target keeps moving.⁹⁵⁶ This means, simultaneously, that the representation of the phenomenon of tourism encounters turns into an intersubjective encounter between the representation (this text) and the reader. In this sense, just like the encounters in tourism settings, also the representations of these encounters must be viewed in terms of the intersubjective system of linguistic communication.⁹⁵⁷

Knowing this, I recognize and fear my power and responsibility when welcoming the reader to encounter my representations of the tourism development encounters. The purpose of telling the stories from San Ramón is not to welcome guests directly to San Ramón, but to welcome the reader to imagine different forms of relations that can take place between self and other and, even more, to envision the ideal ways of engaging with the other. I want to be clear that when writing the travelogue of my research journey, I have wished to leave it to the reader to decide what kinds of encounters could be desirable – in theory and in the Nicaraguan highlands. I avoid making recommendations whether travellers should, or should not engage in future encounters with the communities represented in this study. That is, my position in this research process is not to mediate the words of welcome on the ‘other’s’ behalf.

And yet, my study inevitably joins the group of emancipatory intentions to ‘empower the marginalized voices in tourism’ by speaking about and speaking for the other.⁹⁵⁸ For instance, when I have visited different kinds of blogs

955 On openness of post-critical ethnography, see Hytten 2004; see also Ronkainen 1999.

956 The violence of freezing the object is widely discussed in Büscher et al. 2011 book on Mobile Methods; see also Caton 2012, 1920.

957 Gadamer 1975, in Crossley 1996, 24.

958 See e.g. Ateljevic et al. 2012; For more critical view on this mission, see Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

and travel sites where one can read about San Ramón, I have noticed that nearly all of them are started and maintained by guests.⁹⁵⁹ Consequently, it seems to be the *guests* who possess an active role in inviting *new guests* to tourism destinations; in fact, tourism marketing in particular is above all a matter of welcoming guests on behalf of the ‘hosts’. For several reasons, the local ‘hosts’ living in tourism settings rarely control possibilities to explicitly welcome – or not to welcome – the guests. That is, in tourism the ‘homes’, and the hospitality of these homes, are represented by outsiders. As a result, despite the years of pro-poor and community-based tourism strategies, ‘the poor’ is still not being able to speak for themselves within tourism development.⁹⁶⁰ As Spivak emphasizes, there are various ways of silencing the other. Although the intention might be to materially improve the situation of economically marginalized groups, the discourses produced can easily turn out to reinforce racist, imperialist conceptions and even further silence less privileged groups.⁹⁶¹

Although tourism is often perceived as an effective tool for promoting intercultural understanding and peace⁹⁶², it is also what Veijola and Jokinen⁹⁶³ call as ‘a violent narrative’; that is, it is a narrative which keeps the other immobile and static for the sake of the self. Tourism practices and tourism research are businesses run by mobile outsiders whose interests, imaginings and representations contribute to the way the world is made – to the world-making.⁹⁶⁴ In his research on tourism imaginaries, Salazar⁹⁶⁵ argues ‘[w]e live in imagined (but not imaginary) worlds, using our personal imaginings as well as collective imaginaries to represent our lifeworld and attribute meaning to it’. In his view, the tourism imaginaries and representations of

959 While saying this, I believe that is currently changing when more people in San Ramón have an access to internet. Please note, that UCA San Ramón has also a relatively new Facebook account.

960 Viswanath 2008.

961 Spivak 1991, 26; Aitchinson 2001; Chambers & Buzinde 2015, 3.

962 Higgins-Desbiolles 2006; Ateljevic et al. 2012; Dredge et al. 2013.

963 Veijola & Jokinen 1998; Veijola, 1999; 2014.

964 On worldmaking, see Hollinshead 2007; 2010, Caton 2007; 2013. For more optimistic vision of worldmaking power in tourism, see Dredge et al. 2013, 34.

965 Salazar 2010, 5.

the 'other' are predominantly seducing and romanticizing for the purpose of making the destinations recognizable as visitable tourism sites.⁹⁶⁶ Monika Büscher, John Urry and Katian Witchger⁹⁶⁷ also underline the role of 'imaginative travel' in which the images of places and peoples appear on and move across multiple print and visual media. Acknowledging the violence of postcolonial worldmaking calls for acknowledging the ways in which these representations shape our imaginings and encounters with the 'other'.⁹⁶⁸

Notably, representing others is not only a complicated and contentious task, but actually a political one.⁹⁶⁹ So while not all representation of the 'subaltern other' are by any means desirable,⁹⁷⁰ the question remains whether postcolonial scholars can speak for, and about, the other without perpetuating otherness.⁹⁷¹ Reporting research results, writing travelogue or telling narratives of the other inevitably includes risks of re-constructing and strengthening the dichotomies between self and the other.⁹⁷² This is not a challenge to be taken lightly; in fact, Spivak laments how even two of the most famous scholars of subjectivity, Foucault and Deleuze, have claimed to represent the other as transparent mediums. However, Spivak⁹⁷³ warns of the ethical dangers associated with representing the previously marginalized from the standpoint of a relatively empowered intellectual in the Western academy. She recommends a deconstructive reading of the positivist and essentialist paradigms of 'representation' that support the claims of many benevolent left-wing intellectuals to speak for the oppressed.

Epistemic violence (discussed in chapter 3.3.) refers to the erasure, trivialization and invalidation of ways of knowing that fall outside of Western languages and philosophies.⁹⁷⁴ Epistemic violence can also take place in the

966 Ibid.; Dicks 2003, 4-8.

967 Büscher, Urry & Witchger 2011, 5.

968 Spivak 1988, 283-5; Edensor 1998; Hollinshead 2007; Caton & Santos 2008; 193-200; Tucker & Akama 2009; Salazar 2010; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

969 Blazer 2010; for contentiousness of representation, see also Madison 2004, 4.

970 Spivak 1998, 275-6, 283-5; Morton 2007, 95.

971 Aitchnison 2001, 141; Tucker 2010, 942.

972 Smith & Duffy 2003, 112.

973 Spivak 1988; see also Morton 2007, 107; McEwan 2009, 69, 95; Vrasti 2013, 125).

974 McEwan 2009, 202; see also Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

processes that set up or neglect social and institutional power relations.⁹⁷⁵ For instance, tourism research and practices that trivialize or overlook the colonial legacy of inequalities and impoverishment could, in Spivak's view, be described as a form of epistemic violence.⁹⁷⁶ These forms of violence tend to occur when the voices of the other are being translated, written and represented in the ways that support previous imaginaries about the 'other'. According to Spivak, there are two registers of representation which reconstruct these dislocated subject perspectives of the subaltern other. The first one is the political sense of *speaking for* the other, and the second is the aesthetic/ philosophical sense of *speaking about* the other. This double act of representation leads to a situation where the other is not 'speaking'. For Spivak, this is nearly a dead-end.⁹⁷⁷

Ethical saying

Going back to Levinas' discussions on totality and infinity, it seems like this kind of representation between self and other resonates with the conventional *said* (totality) instead of *the saying* (infinity). Hence, significantly, the ethical relations that we discuss and explore are not metaphysical but take place in language, as traces of the ethical. In fact, for Levinas Western philosophy in general is preoccupied with the *said* instead of the openness of the *saying*.⁹⁷⁸ This preoccupation is means trying to get and represent as sharp picture of the focal phenomenon as possible. However, Levinas, among other philosophers of ethical subjectivities, argue that getting a sharp picture of the other – knowing the other – is not desirable or possible. The search for ethical subjectivities calls for decolonizing our minds by 'unlearning the privilege of knowing the other'⁹⁷⁹, so that the privilege

975 Kapoor 2004, 628.

976 Instead of being a phenomenon unique to tourism, such neglect is something that actually forms a pivotal part of the neoliberal belief where everybody is expected to have equal potentialities to bloom.

977 See Spivak 1988; Kapoor 2004; however, Spivak (1995) presents 'Devi's *Imaginary Maps* as an example of ethical representation.

978 See Hiddleston 2009, 19, 108, 163; Ladyga 2011, 224-5.

979 Spivak 1990, 20; see also Kuokkanen 2007, 115.

of knowing becomes replaced by infinite curiosity and wonder.⁹⁸⁰ In line with Irigaray's⁹⁸¹ thought, this wonder goes beyond what is suitable for us as the other never suits us simply.

In these discussions the most practical instruction for ethical representation might be scepticism and critique of closed ends. For Levinas⁹⁸², ethical representation would require desiring the omnipresent excess of the *saying* instead of privileging the *said*. At the risk of oversimplifying Levinas' thought, the *said* could be defined as something with totality and limits, while the *saying* refers to openness, to 'the living world', to a gesture towards another human being. These two co-existing facets, the *said* and the *saying*, can also be thought of in connection with Derrida's⁹⁸³ writings on the conditional laws of hospitality and unconditional welcoming. Just as the law and the ethics of hospitality are not opposites or alternatives to each other, neither are the *said* and the *saying*. Instead, the *saying* expands the potentially reductive and oppressive boundaries of the *said*. Hence, the 'double session of representation', discussed by Spivak, could be dismantled by a missing (third) sense, Levinas' *ethical saying*. That is, Levinas' ideas suggest that the 'solution' to the situation where 'the subaltern cannot speak', could be found in ethical saying, which opens up new spaces to speak even for the subaltern. Thus, openness of saying means abandoning the intentions of knowing the other as something that is epistemically violent. To put it differently, adapting Levinas' mindset, hospitality could be used to de-establish speaking for and speaking about the other and to envision the ethical force of *saying*. This ethical saying does not aim to define the other as an object of knowledge, but merely a desire of infinity, openness and receptivity.⁹⁸⁴

I claim that shifting the units and levels of analysis in academic research could allow us to take small but pivotal steps from the *said* towards the *saying*. By this 'shift' I refer to a more careful acknowledgement and articula-

980 Irigaray 1993.

981 *Ibid.*, 74, 81 in Smith & Duffy 2003, 113.

982 Levinas OB 1998, 37-8; 45-51.

983 Derrida & Rottenberg 1999, 19-29.

984 Levinas OB 1998; for Levinas, ethics and responsibility transcend the individual agency of self.

tion of what research, as well as the representations of research, is expected to explain about the social worlds studied. In my study, I consider it more fruitful, and less dubious, to discuss of normative theoretical ideas when the unit of analysis is the *encounter* instead of the individual, community, ethnic group or nation.⁹⁸⁵

For me, this is a contribution from hermeneutic phenomenology which can help to decolonize methodologies; that is, to make the methodologies more hospitable, by training the focus on the imaginings and experiences of the phenomenon at hand. Focusing on encounters prevents, on the one hand, the possibility of making the researcher ‘transparent’ and, on the other, treating the other as an object of study. Hence, the focus on encounters seeks an answer to Caton’s question: ‘[w]hat it means to treat other people as subjects in the context of tourism world?’⁹⁸⁶ In this study, seeing the other as a subject denies the possibility of treating people as homogeneous groups who could be categorized and studied and ‘swallowed as analytical units’.⁹⁸⁷ What is more, the focus on encounters lays an emphasis on the intersubjectivity of social mobility in every encounter.

The representation of my analysis does not aim to ‘tidy up’ the social relations⁹⁸⁸, but to enhance different ways of understanding and giving meanings to tourism development encounters.⁹⁸⁹ My appreciation of messiness draws inspiration from our previous discussions of untidiness and untidy guests in doing tourism.⁹⁹⁰ I have come to agree with Spivak, who claims that the failure to know, evaluate, understand, describe and also *to represent* the other can be seen as a success, because this failure can be seen as a sign of openness towards the other.⁹⁹¹ It is also a sign of a reduced ego, one which no longer relies on categories and conceptualizations of the other. In this sense, I also view the failure to organize tourism encounters – to make them

985 Dredge & Hales 2012; Cerwonka & Malkki 2007, p. 75

986 Caton 2012, 1907.

987 Cerwonka 2007, 75; Gupta & Ferguson 1997a in Cerwonka 2007, 75; Morton 2008, 103.

988 Veijola et al. 2014, 2-3; see also Dredge et al. 2013, 32-5.

989 Ibid.; Jamal & Everett 2007, 58; Dredge et al. 2013.

990 Veijola et al 2014.

991 Because, also hospitality and welcome are never fixed – said.

more predictable and manageable – as a sign of a certain kind of success story much needed in tourism studies. Consequently, I hope that my representations can be considered successful such that it leaves, in Derrida's⁹⁹² words, the door open for the unexpected.

Büscher, et al.⁹⁹³ propose that the temptation to retrain phenomena in order to study them would destroy them.⁹⁹⁴ In my study I have aimed to move and develop with the 'target', the tourism development initiatives in San Ramón. Painting or taking a picture while the target is in rapid motion should also explain the blurriness of representations. In tourism research this blurriness has recently become more accepted, and in some circles even celebrated.⁹⁹⁵ We have begun to appreciate those who have dared to publish photos where the artist's finger is partially covering the lens, as it reminds us of the embodied person behind the camera who aims the camera according to her or his personal interest. Although hermeneutic phenomenology and postcolonial critique both call for heightened super-self-reflexivity, the purpose of the following representation of my analysis is not to show 'selfies' of me, taken in other people's homes. Instead I aim to present images of many different kinds of encounters. In order to describe the historical and political context, I start by taking a look back in time, and then move into highlighting more recent encounters. So while remaining mainly in contemporary settings, I wish to bring out connections showing how the encounters in the past might have shaped the imaginings of the present.

Last, I also wish to address a very practical issue concerning the ethics of representation and the researcher's responsibility to protect informants and interviewees. In San Ramón, this question is by no means unproblematic. Although I have carefully asked all my interlocutors for their approval to use the interviews as data in this study, I have chosen to protect their identities

992 Derrida AEL 1999, 26-7.

993 Büscher et al. 2011.

994 Ibid., 1.

995 see Salazar 2010; Ateljevic et al. 2012; Dredge et al. 2013; Veijola et al. 2014.

by using pseudonyms.⁹⁹⁶ However, the villages are still recognizable and changing the names of the villages would not make sense – especially as I have been writing about the same villages in the past. Hence, I hope that the reader of this study treats it as a retrospective narrative and analysis of snapshots which belong to the past. Instead of claiming that entire communities would, or would not welcome development projects, my overall aim has been to heighten attention and respect towards the other's welcome.

⁹⁹⁶ United States has had a greater mark of birth names in Nicaragua than in many other Latin American countries. See 'Nicaragua-names' the invisiblecastle.blogspot.se, website accessed on 8 June 2013.

5 UNCONDITIONAL WELCOME OF TOURISM TO NICARAGUA

“La viste desde el aire, esta es Managua,
de pie entre las ruinas, bella en sus baldios,
pobre como las armas combatientes,
rica como el sangre de sus hijos.

Ya vés, viajero, está su puerta abierta, todo el país es
una inmensa casa. No, no te equivocaste de aeropuerto:
entrá nomás, estás en Nicaragua.”

“The view from the air – that is Managua,
standing among the ruins, beautiful in its austerity
poor as the fighting weapons,
rich as the blood of its sons.

You see, Traveller, its door is open, the whole country is
one immense home. No, you have not landed at the
wrong airport:
just enter, you are in Nicaragua”

Julio Cortázar / Noticia para Viajeros
(Sergio Ramírez, 1985, 9-10)

Nicaragua’s capital city, Managua, welcomes its visitors through the memory of Augusto Sandino, the legendary Nicaraguan who fought in the 1930s to send away the ‘Yanqui imperialists’. The airplanes land in an airport named after him; the souvenir shops sell t-shirts with his picture printed on them; and his silhouette decorates the horizon of Managua, as a reminder

of resistance against foreign oppression, as well as that of the local elites. Visitors tend to be surprised by the huge pink posters which celebrate the slogans of the ruling government, the Sandinistas, who carry the name of their hero – and the hero of the entire country.⁹⁹⁷ Most foreign travellers leave Managua soon after their arrival and head, for instance, towards the Pacific beaches of San Juan del Sur, the volcanoes and the volcanic lake Laguna de Apoyo, or the Corn Islands on the Caribbean side of the country.

Especially popular destinations are the colonial towns of the *Ruta Colonial*, or colonial route, which snakes through the western side of the country.⁹⁹⁸ In these towns the guests can enjoy the memories of the colonial spirit; as an illustration, after a day of walking along picturesque streets and visiting churches, the evening and dinner programme offers travellers a more personal and vivid experience of what earlier colonial encounters were like. The programme includes a play called *El Güegüense*, a story of misfortune and suffering under Spanish rule. It was written most likely in the mid-sixteenth century, and is thus one of the earliest and most important pieces of writing about the fusion of the cultures of the indigenous Indians and the colonial Spanish. The masked character, El Güegüense, is a peddler of mixed Indian and Spanish blood – a quick-witted, mischievous and sharp-tongued protagonist. The play expresses the frustrations of a ‘mixed-race people’, who were looked down on and mistreated by the Spanish colonizers, who held the ‘purity’ of their own blood in great esteem.⁹⁹⁹

The story of *El Güegüense* is still regarded as an important expression of Nicaraguan identity and the play is a widely celebrated symbol of the country’s culture.¹⁰⁰⁰ According to some, Güegüense was a hard-working, smart and prosperous merchant who did not want to pay taxes to the Spanish crown. To others, he was a small, skilled merchant, but also a rascal and a fraud, who used his many skills to fool the Spanish authorities, not only to evade taxes but also to have his son marry the daughter of the governor. Whichever

997 Palmer 1988 on ‘Carlos Fonseca and the Construction of Sandinismo in Nicaragua’.

998 INTUR 2011a, 117.

999 Plunkett 1999, 73; Kinloch Tijerino 2008, 83–4.

1000 Ibid. 73; The book of Nicaragua by Plunkett (1999, 73) is written mainly for potential travellers, presents the Nicaraguan society with the words of *Culture of Resistance*.

interpretation is the more accurate, the story expresses the resistance of a nation against foreign invaders, and it constitutes one of the most important elements in the cultural heritage of the Nicaraguan people. For many the play is a worthy representation of the stereotype of a Nicaraguan: a rebellious and clever person with a sense of justice and suspiciousness towards authorities.¹⁰⁰¹

Even though the Spanish rule brought a brutal end to indigenous customs, traditions and forms of worship, many of the mythical figures and gods revered by the Indians survived and became then incorporated to the stories about the conquerors cruelty. ‘The restless souls of conquistadors, headless priests and witch-like women’, as Hazel Plunkett¹⁰⁰² puts it, are among a host of characters who recall the horror of the colonial period and haunt the Nicaraguan imagination. Hence, peculiarly, tourists are welcomed to the country by presenting a play of resistance and challenges related to the arrival of outsiders. This is by no means something unique. For instance, the Maori welcoming ceremony in New Zealand involves performing a Maori war dance, *haka*, whose purpose is to intimidate and to learn the intentions of the visitor.¹⁰⁰³

It seems obvious that colonialism and tourism even have other connections besides the colonial towns and plays, not least the acceptance of power relations based on the visitors’ privilege to enter when- and wherever they please. In other words, coloniality and transnational tourism development are connected by a phenomenon whereby ‘the guests take over hosting the party’.¹⁰⁰⁴ Nicaragua’s history is generally told through the interventions it has endured; indeed, it has had the role of recipient: it has received aid, external economic guidance and Venezuelan oil money, been the object of natural catastrophes, and so forth. At the same time, these narratives neglect the things that Nicaragua has had to give away to these visitors: gold, coffee and even some of its beaches.¹⁰⁰⁵ Walter Knut¹⁰⁰⁶ describes Nicaragua as an

1001 Ibid. ViaNica

1002 Plunkett 1999, 74.

1003 Kuokkanen 2007, 131; see also Johnston 2008.

1004 For criticism towards the growths of tourism industries as a form of new colonialism, see *Turismo Placebo* edited by Macía Blázquez & Ernest Cañada, 2011; And see also Schilcher 2007; Bianchi 2015.

1005 Kinloch Tijerino 2008.

1006 Knut 1993, 3; See also Pakkasvirta & Teivainen 1992.

extreme case of foreign intrusions and internal anarchy: 'From the days of Spanish conquest itself, Nicaragua was already a battleground of competing expeditions of discovery and conquest which set the basis for the factional conflicts during the centuries to come'. One story told today as an exception to this historical trend – and a tale of gullibility about the country's role in international relations – is the fact that Nicaraguans collected money to be sent to the poor Nordic country of Finland surviving and recovering from the Second World War.¹⁰⁰⁷ This is treated as a somewhat surprising incident in the friendship between Finland and Nicaragua, as for a short moment Nicaraguans had taken the role of helper, instead of passive receiver of aid.

The purpose of this chapter is to sketch a picture of the historical, political and social context in which the encounters that drive contemporary tourism development occur. With a focus on the historicity of experiences, the chapter fosters debate on how contemporary modes of tourism – even the supposedly sustainable ones – might re-open prior histories and experiences of colonial and neo-colonial encounters.¹⁰⁰⁸ I will discuss previous visits by outsiders which might still shape, or perhaps even haunt, the subjectivities and 'imaginings' of the hosts. Drawing especially on Derrida's¹⁰⁰⁹ double law of hospitality, the chapter focuses on efforts to calculate the risks of welcoming while keeping the door open to strangers. Instead of proceeding chronologically, the chapter is structured in terms of different levels of hospitality and different actors who are as the *subjects of welcome* and *subjects of hospitality*. By defining 'home' primarily in a political sense, I move from the idea of 'home nation' towards the communities and individual homes where people receive their guests.

The structure of the chapter is the following: The first section focuses on the experiences Nicaraguan hosts had of the encounters that took place

1007 The story was also told at the goodbye party of the Finnish Embassy in Managua in May 2013. Source of information, articles in newspapers in Central America: 'El Ejemplo de Nicaragua. Porque no Ayudamos A Finlandia?' Editorial del "Diario de Occidente", de Sta. Ana, El Salvador 26 de Enero 1940. See also 'Dos niños nicaragüenses dan sus centavos para la Ayuda de Nicaragua a Finlandia'.

1008 See Ahmed 2000, 13.

1009 Derrida AEL 1999, 2000.

before the burgeoning of rural tourism initiatives. The data that I have used for the analysis consist primarily of histories, poems and songs of Nicaraguan intellectuals, policy documents, newspaper articles, and interviews with tourism experts working in the country. The purpose of this section is to approach tourism encounters from different points of view, including the viewpoints of Nicaraguan intellectuals, the Nicaraguan government, NGOs and development aid agencies, as well as those living in, or close to, tourist destinations. By doing this, I wish to make it clear that Nicaraguans are by no means a homogenous group of welcomers. Rather, it is obvious that different actors can give very different meanings to the arrival of guests: in particular the more recent history of tourism development in has shown the ways in which different groups of people experience the impacts of tourism in diverse ways.¹⁰¹⁰

Section 5.2. focuses on the recent ambitions of the Nicaraguan tourism ministry, NGOs and international development organizations to democratize tourism development by turning their attention to the well-being of the rural communities around the country. More specifically, the purpose of the analysis is to deconstruct the meanings that the tourism experts give to their encounters with people living in economically marginalized rural areas. The data here consist, first, of interviews with the tourism experts working in the ministry, in international aid organizations and NGOs and, second, of notes based on participatory observation in policy and strategy meetings. The third section changes the scene from urban environments towards the northern highlands. In giving a general picture of the context in San Ramón and the early days of tourism development in the region, I rely greatly on the writings of the local historian Edgard Rivas Chozas and on the stories told by local tourist guides. These accounts, together with the interviews conducted in the communities of San Ramón in 2008, then allow me to re-tell the story of how the people living in these coffee-farming communities have welcomed tourism and have experienced the arrival of tourism experts and tourists into their homes.

1010 Cañada & Gascón 2007ab; Mowforth et al 2008; Tuulentie & Sarkki 2009, 19-20; Smith M. 2009; Bianchi 2015.

The fourth and last section, drawing together the insights of the chapter, points out that, in the light of colonialism and more recent interventions in Nicaragua, it is problematic to assume that the others would choose to leave their doors wide open for everything unexpected and foreign.¹⁰¹¹ In fact, taking for granted that the other unconditionally welcomes self undermines previous as well as contemporary efforts to decolonize encounters between ourselves.

5.1 Exclusive forms of hospitality

“Ay Nicaragua, Nicaragüita
La flor mas linda de mi querer
Abonada con la bendita, Nicaragüita,
Sangre de Diriangen.
Ay Nicaragua sos mas dulcita
Que la mielita de Tamagas
Pero ahora que ya sos libre, Nicaragüita,
Yo te quiero mucho mas”

“Oh Nicaragua, little Nicaragua
The most beautiful flower of all
fertilized with the blessed blood of Diriangen
Oh Nicaragua, you are sweeter
Than the honey from tamagas
But now that you are free, little Nicaragua
I love you much more”

Carlos Mejía Godoy¹⁰¹²

1011 Derrida 2005, 6.

1012 Carlos Mejía Godoy's 'Nicaragua Nicaragüita', performed with his band los de Palacagüina, is associated with the Sandinista revolutionary movement and could be described as an unofficial anthem in Nicaragua. See the performed live in a concert in Managua in 1984 in documentary called "April in Managua – The Concert for Peace".

Uninterrupted practices of colonialism have marked Latin American history. Despite the long process of decolonization, many would take the view that countries like Nicaragua are still not free from foreign oppression. In fact, it would be impossible to analyse Nicaragua's position without an understanding of its encounters and relations with 'outsiders'.¹⁰¹³ During the last 500 hundred years or so, an increasing number of visitors have arrived in the geographical area now known as Nicaragua. It was sometime in the beginning of the 16th century, as far as we know, when the Niquirano Indians began to receive surprise visitors to their villages on the banks of the lakes of Nicaragua. Soon after the Aztec Indians from north did so, the Spanish conquerors 'bumped into' the region. Although the locals were not hiding or escaping from anyone, the arrival of the Spaniards is often eurocentrically and ambiguously described as the *discovery* of Americas, not its conquest, as many especially in Latin America wish to call it. While many in Latin America would term it a *conquest*, the history is largely written based on the visitors' travelogues.¹⁰¹⁴

However, Delores Huff¹⁰¹⁵ argues that today it is inadequately acknowledged that the early colonists were actually often 'unconditionally welcomed', as Derrida¹⁰¹⁶ would put it, by the indigenous peoples. Typically, the hosts welcomed the arrivals, the guests, and treated them according their customs and to their laws of hospitality.¹⁰¹⁷ According to Rauna Kuokkanen¹⁰¹⁸ indigenous people were in general eager to welcome the 'other' in order to learn from the stranger – and to share the power and knowledge of their guests. However, and as we know, this hospitality was in most cases turned against the hosts.¹⁰¹⁹ The conquered local populations were seen either

1013 see Moraña et al. 2008, 10; Pakkasvirta 2005; Kinloch Tijerino 2008

1014 Dussel 2013, 26-31; Martin, 2000; Pakkasvirta & Teivainen 1992, 11; Rivas Choza 2008, 19.

1015 See Huff in Kuokkanen 2007, 130.

1016 Derrida 2002; 2006, 6.

1017 Nicaraguan historian Kinloch Tijerino (2008, 50) describes that the indigenous people gave gold to the conquistadors and received clothes as exchange.

1018 Kuokkanen 2007, 132.

1019 Ibid. 130.

as inferior and fundamentally different from, or as imperfect copies of, Europeans, which justified the ‘civilizing, emancipatory and developing’ missions carried out as part of colonial domination. Despite the present day celebration of multiculturalism, the idea of helping the ‘other’ to follow the development of ‘self’ forms an uncomfortable part of the development aid discourses.¹⁰²⁰ This dimension is brought up especially by Latin American post-development scholars, such as Escobar and Mignolo.¹⁰²¹

The discoverers, conquistadors and guests of the 16th century did not come empty handed, but with Christianity, slavery, fatal diseases and territorial devastation, to name a few contributions. What is more, the hospitality of the hosts was ultimately abused as the guests stayed until the hosts were exhausted and exploited. This arrangement established a capitalist world order where the newly discovered areas became peripheries that supported the accumulation of wealth in the hegemonic centres of Europe.¹⁰²² It is good to point out that the experience of colonialism in Latin America is very different from that of Africa and Asia.¹⁰²³ Mignolo and other Latin American scholars use the concept of *colonial difference* to call attention to ‘the differential time-space where a particular region becomes connected to the world-system of colonial domination’.¹⁰²⁴ For instance, Moraña, Dussell and Jáuregui¹⁰²⁵ borrow the concept of *colonial difference*, in order to emphasize the particularity of Latin American historical, political, social and cultural modes of articulation within the system of domination throughout the centuries. These authors emphasize that although the wave of independence of Latin American countries took place in the 19th century (which was earlier than on the other colonized continents), the wave by no means interrupted the colonial practices imposed by foreign powers: these practices only became different. For many Latin American scholars the

1020 Todorov 1984; Pakkasvirta & Teivainen 1992, 14; Moraña et al. 2008; Dussel 2013, 32-40.

1021 Escobar & Mignolo 2010.

1022 Dussel 2013, 32-40; Moraña et al. 2008; Pakkasvirta & Teivainen 1992; Ron Ignace in Kuokkanen 2007, 130; Kinloch Tijerino 2008.

1023 Moraña et al. 2008, 5.

1024 Ibid. 8.

1025 Ibid. 18

analysis of decolonization and colonial difference seems more meaningful than focusing on scenarios that could be called ‘postcolonial’.¹⁰²⁶

Just like in many other countries in the region, in Nicaragua the guests started to change after the study gained its independence from Spain in 1821. United States arrived ‘waving’ the Monroe Doctrine, promulgated in 1823, which declared and justified the country’s influence and control in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Doctrine included possible visits even with army uniforms and band wagons, if necessary. This was the beginning of the continuous tradition of ‘Dollar Diplomacy’, which included political involvement in other countries’ internal affairs, conspicuous interventions and support for political uprisings.¹⁰²⁷ The US’s presence and control in Nicaragua was allowed by the fighting of two rival factions, the ‘Conservatives’ of Granada and the ‘Liberals’ of León. Meanwhile, US companies like United Fruit secured great deals on land acquisitions, mining rights, export of bananas and even control of banking and tax collection in the country.¹⁰²⁸ In the 1850s and 1860s Lake Nicaragua and San Juan River were important routes for the steamships of Cornelius Vanderbilt’s ‘American Atlantic and Pacific Ship Canal Company’. Since there were no railways through the US, steamships were used to transport the treasures found during the Californian gold rush.¹⁰²⁹ The US was also closely involved in planning a canal route through Nicaraguan territory – a project that has been recently revived, and strongly resisted by many Nicaraguans, now more than 100 years later.

It was Augusto Sandino, the legend whose silhouette decorates the horizon of Managua, who in the late 1920s and early 1930s led the guerilla war to drive out the US troops and influence from Nicaragua.¹⁰³⁰ However, Sandino’s plan for a free Nicaragua, free elections, peace, and agrarian cooperatives had to wait until the 1980s revolution, as he was

1026 See also Ranta 2014, 57.

1027 Teivainen 1992; Martin 2000; Mendieta 2008; Moraña et al. 2008; Kinloch Tijerino 2008, 151.

1028 Kinloch Tijerino 2008, 135. To do all this they enacted agrarian reform laws that either pushed Indians and peasants off their land or reduced them to sharecroppers.

1029 Ibid. 151-2.

1030 Pakkasvirta 2005; Palmer 1988

killed by the Nicaraguan new dictator-to-be, Anastasio Somoza. The Somoza family ruled between 1937 and 1979 and were supported by the US's foreign policy, which favoured right-wing authoritarianism over struggles for social justice.¹⁰³¹ In Nicaragua the Somozas became symbols of power and greed who concentrated development in primary cities while the rural areas and the Caribbean coast of the country remained impoverished. The family ended up owning the vast majority of the best land in Nicaragua, as well as most of the major domestic farms and factories, the airline, construction companies, warehouses, shipping lines and even the cemeteries in Managua. The demand for political change was met with military repression and the National Guard became a form of extortion business. What is more, in 1972 a massive earthquake killed approximately 10,000 people in the capital city of Managua and left 50,000 families homeless. As National Guardsmen looted businesses, Somoza controlled disaster aid with his personal wealth growing to an estimated \$400 million. Following the uprising of the people in 1979, Somoza fled Nicaragua, taking with him the capital reserves in the bank and leaving behind approximately 1.6 billion US dollars in debt.¹⁰³²

The four decades of Somocista dictatorship ended with a revolution in 1979. The revolution allowed the revival of the desired 'map of Nicaragua' which Sandino had left behind him.¹⁰³³ Almost 25 percent of the agrarian land, owned earlier by Somoza and his allies, was now re-distributed to Nicaraguans. However, in the 1980s, US-financed, -trained, -armed and -organized counter-revolutionaries, the *contras*, waged war against the left-wing Sandinista government of Nicaragua.¹⁰³⁴ Many people in the Western countries showed their sympathy towards Nicaragua by opposing the aggressive and interventionist US foreign policy. The solidarity movement created a form of travelling which can be seen as an anteced-

1031 Mowforth et al. 2008, 68; Teivainen 1992, 189, 199. Anastasio Somoza, admirer of Hitler and Mussolini, promptly became anti-fascist when the US declared war against the Axis in 1942.

1032 Kinloch Tijerino 2008, 294.

1033 Ibid. 305-12; Rivas Choza 2008, 53

1034 Sklar 1988; Belli, 2002; Kinloch Tijerino 2008, 321-31; Ramírez, 2011.

ent of contemporary models of community-based tourism and volunteer tourism. Young and politically active people arrived to help with the coffee harvest, to build and paint schools and health centres and to live with local families.¹⁰³⁵ In addition to their voluntary work, these guests were interested in visiting the Solentiname and Ometepe islands more in a role of a tourist.¹⁰³⁶ Similar movements took place in Cuba, Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala¹⁰³⁷. After the electoral defeat of the Sandinistas in 1989, these kinds of trips diminished and were then replaced with different kinds of tourism initiatives. When the Sandinistas returned to power in 2007, the mood of solidarity was revitalized, but soon killed by a 'leftist Somoza-like regime' (without brutality) led by President Daniel Ortega and his wife, Rosario Murillo.¹⁰³⁸

It is worth noticing that *political tourism* still continues in Nicaragua and takes different forms. Besides the excursions that take the travellers up to the coffee highlands, there are, for instance, educational trips that offer the possibility to learn from the contemporary civil society movements in the country. Other examples, somewhat similar to those in Nicaragua, include the tourism in Mexico which focuses on the Zapatista movement and the on the life of the legendary leader Subcomandante Marcos; another, obvious example is Cuba, which is often perceived as one of the last chances to experience a 'real' socialist system. Then again, it is still more common that travellers choose *not* to travel to areas where there are political struggles. For instance, the effects of the Arab Spring around 2011 have left some of the previously popular tourism destinations without visitors.¹⁰³⁹ Hence, it would be timely to direct more attention to how different political ideologies mobilize travellers, and how such ideologies might become mobilized through tourism. Interestingly, the idea of political tourism could include the possibility of political activism while travelling, but also of taking a stand

1035 Mowforth, et al. 2008, 68; McRoberts 2012.

1036 Thanks to Jussi Pakkasvirta for this information (personal communication).

1037 Mowforth et al. 2008, 68.

1038 Equipo Nitlapan – Envió 2008, 3-13; See also <http://www.confidencial.com.ni/articulo/16321/nicaragua-on-the-brink-of-dictatorship>. Website accessed 15th March 2014.

1039 See Telfer & Hashimoto 2014, 400, 412.

by not travelling. I see these alternatives as something that brings tourism into the nexus of political support and responsibility.¹⁰⁴⁰

It seems like the Western imaginaries of Nicaragua have been shaped primarily by representations of poverty, the Sandinista revolution, war, natural disasters, political scandals, corruption and aid-dependency.¹⁰⁴¹ As the majority of the Nicaraguan population lives on less than 2 US dollars per day, the literature and articles tend to begin with the statement of how ‘Nicaragua is the second poorest country in the Western Hemisphere after Haiti’.¹⁰⁴² Hence, the tourism developers have been working hard to change these pervasive images of the country towards ones featuring safety and natural beauty. Depending on the government in power, the country has been sold with slogans such as ‘Nicaragua, a country with heart’, ‘Nicaragua, unique, original’, ‘Country of lakes and volcanoes’ or ‘Country of well-being’. Hence, it is easy to understand that the New York Times’¹⁰⁴³ ranking of Nicaragua as the number 3 tourism destination in the world in 2013 was received in Nicaraguan tourism circles as great news. In addition, the recent reports about the low levels of violence and crime in Nicaragua are contributing to the process of changing the negative stereotypes of the country.¹⁰⁴⁴

This has meant turning the image of the country from being a place people *escape from*, to a place people wish to *escape to*. Besides tourism, international mobility on the Nicaraguan borders has mainly consisted of Nicaraguan migrant workers going to and coming back from Costa Rica. While it has been difficult to know how many people have left Nicaragua in order to work, the estimate place the figure at around 400 000 – 800 000 people.¹⁰⁴⁵ Besides mobility of people, this has meant mobility of remittances that the Nicaraguans working in Costa Rica send back home to their families.

1040 Political responsibility in tourism, see Hall 1994, 92-109; Veijola et al. 2013

1041 see also Mendieta 2008.

1042 See, for instance, Burney 2007, 2; Höckert 2009, 25; Zapata et al. 2011, 729.

1043 New York Times (Jan 11, 2013) ‘The 46 Places to Go in 2013. Whether you travel to eat or shop, surf or ski, new adventures await’.

1044 See INTUR 2011a, 83; See the article by Jill Replogle ‘Why Nicaraguan Kids Aren’t Fleeing To U.S? It is Central America’s poorest country, but its kids aren’t heading north like those in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.’ Published in July 29 2014.

1045 Please listen to the song ‘Rios de gente’ by Nicaraguan artist Perrozompopo.

However, while many people from Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala decide to look for better living opportunities from United States, there are only relatively few Nicaraguans doing so. A recent article, titled ‘Why Nicaraguan Kids Aren’t Fleeing to U.S.’, suggested that some of the reasons for this lay precisely in the safety and tranquility of life in Nicaragua.¹⁰⁴⁶ Nicaraguan tourism authorities have also proposed the growth of tourism sector as one of the vital ways to prevent emigration from the country.¹⁰⁴⁷

While some tourism practitioners have predicted Nicaragua’s future as ‘the Next Costa Rica’ with wealth and touristic appeal, Nicaraguan tourism minister Mario Salinas has expressed that Nicaragua’s greatest asset is actually the fact that it is *not* like Costa Rica.¹⁰⁴⁸ In any case, it cannot be denied that the apparent success story of Costa Rica has affected Nicaraguan visions for future; that is, as tourism has been growing rapidly in Central America, Nicaragua has been eager to jump onto that bandwagon with its ‘big brothers’.¹⁰⁴⁹ Since the 1990s, Nicaraguan right-wing governments have perceived tourism as a unique possibility to welcome foreign investors and foreign income into the country. Simultaneously, it has been a great challenge to figure out how to make airplanes land in Nicaragua. The most attractive airplanes have been those carrying investors, potential entrepreneurs, tourists, surfers, students and retired couples searching for second homes on the Pacific coastline.¹⁰⁵⁰ In addition to searching for new possibilities to turn Central American indigenous and colonial history into tourist attractions, this has meant a ‘race to the bottom’. In other words, the foreign investors and tourism entrepreneurs have not been attracted only by the ‘lakes and volcanoes’, but also by extremely low costs of labour, fully tax-free income, privatization of the Pacific coastline and so on.¹⁰⁵¹

1046 See Replogle, July 24 2014.

1047 INTUR 2010a; 2009a.

1048 Barrera 1998, 51; Burney 2007, 2; for research on tourism development in Costa-Rica, see for instance, van der Duim & Caalders 2008; Matarrita-Cascante 2010; Quesada 2014.

1049 Barrera 1998; Burney 2007, 41.

1050 INTUR 2011b.

1051 Cañada & Merodio 2004, 1; Bonilla & Mordt 2008; Mowforth et al. 2008; see also PRONicaragua 2014.

Ratifications of several free trade agreements have enhanced the Nicaraguan invitations and encouraged international companies to enjoy the benefits of the free trade zones.¹⁰⁵² For instance, the General Agreement on Trade and Services, GATS, is one of the trade agreements administrated and controlled by the World Trade Organization, WTO, which has extended the privatization, deregulation and reduction of trade barriers on goods into the trade in services such as tourism.¹⁰⁵³ The European Commission's website describes GATS as 'not just something that exists between governments. It is first and foremost an instrument for the benefit of business.'¹⁰⁵⁴ Under the agreement, countries are obligated to treat foreign companies in the same way as they treat domestic ones, a policy which makes it impossible to compel foreign investors, for instance, to use local products in tourism destinations.¹⁰⁵⁵

More planes land in Nicaragua, including those of a low-fare airline called *Spiritair*, and tourism has diversified the demography of foreign visitors in the country. As in the 1980s when most of the foreigners were US soldiers, volunteer workers on coffee plantations and representatives from development aid organizations, today there are more than 1 million international tourists per year, crossing Nicaragua's borders. Approximately 65 percent of these tourists arrive from other Central American countries, 25 percent from North America, and the remaining 10 percent from elsewhere in the world.¹⁰⁵⁶ I should point out here that it is somewhat unclear how the mobility of many Nicaraguan migrants between Costa Rica and Nicaragua shaped these tourism statistics.¹⁰⁵⁷ In recent years, Nicaraguan tourism officials have expected the tourism sector to continue to grow by 10 percent annually.¹⁰⁵⁸ The tourism ministers have tried to guarantee this

1052 See ProNicaragua. These advantages are, interestingly, offered equally by the supposedly leftist Sandinista government.

1053 For more information on GATS and tourism, see Schilcher 2007; Scheyvens 2011, 62; Sharpley 2014, 12.

1054 Mowforth et al. 2008, 29.

1055 Kalisch 2001, 4 in Mowforth et al. 2008, 31.

1056 INTUR 2013.

1057 See also Rocha 2008, 26.

1058 INTUR 2011a, 2013.

by, for instance, attending tourism fairs in the United States and Europe in order to attract new partners and establish new contacts.

Using Derrida's conceptualization of hospitality, one could see GATS as an instrument that has helped Nicaraguan tourism officials to make Nicaraguan hospitality as *unconditional* as possible. It has helped to ensure that the 'door' to Nicaragua stays open. One of the main actors in this process has been the public-private organization called ProNicaragua, which main task is to attract new investors to the country; that is, to play the role of an active *subject of welcome*. In February 2012, I organized an interview with the representatives of ProNicaragua in their office in Managua. When communicating with the ProNicaragua officials prior to and during the visit, I made it very clear that I was a researcher conducting academic study on rural tourism development in the country. However, in the actual meeting I was not allowed to ask the interview questions that I had planned; rather, the people I met wanted to focus on a high-quality PowerPoint presentation, which had obviously been prepared for potential investors. It appeared they were receiving me after all as a potential candidate who might become interested in starting my business in Nicaragua. They were proudly describing how in 1992 only five companies were operating in free trade zones, but that the ratification of several free trade agreements had made it possible that in 2005 the number was already over 100 companies. The PowerPoint¹⁰⁵⁹ presentation, and the entire discourse of ProNicaragua, celebrated the beautiful nature, empty beaches, safety, and the Nicaraguans, who were not poor but happy. It seemed that in this context the possible demands for responsibility, equality, sustainability, were perceived mainly as themes and conditions that could frighten away potential investors. Even the supposedly leftist Sandinista government wants to make their guests feel at home by openly inviting them to stay for free, without paying taxes, as long as they want to. However, as the encounters between those with capital are filled with this cosy spirit of 'mi casa es su casa', the critiques of

1059 See for example PRONicaragua 2015 www.pronicaragua.org, website accessed in 5 September 2015.

the current regime have openly questioned the possible ‘unofficial’ gifts that the investors might bring and give to their welcomers.¹⁰⁶⁰

When I left the office of ProNicaragua, I shared a taxi with two other passengers, both in their sixties. During the taxi ride they discussed with the driver about the ongoing demonstrations where Nicaraguans were demanding that the government pay them their retirement money as it had promised. After a while they interrupted their conversation to ask me why I had come to Nicaragua and whether I was enjoying my stay. When they heard the topic of my research, they all laughed heartily and commented on how they had never had an opportunity to travel as tourists. One of the passengers pointed out that given the current situation with the pensions, she would probably never be able to take part in tourism in her home country. I thought how I had only twenty minutes earlier watched a colourful PowerPoint presentation with great statistics on Nicaraguan well-being and quality of life. While my co-travellers continued chatting about different places that they would like to visit in Nicaragua, I felt thankful for this kind of thought-provoking Nicaraguan taxi ride, which made me painfully aware of the socio-economic contradictions in the country.

In Nicaragua, just like in many other countries, extensive criticism has been presented of GATS as an instrument which reflects and reinforces the existing inequality in the global economic system.¹⁰⁶¹ In the context of tourism development, the critiques have argued that many of these ‘trade-restrictive obstacles’ would be needed to guarantee that the host regions would receive benefits from tourism development which is based on local resources.¹⁰⁶² However, Nicaragua can be seen as a good example of a developing country which suffers from a “growth fetish” when it comes to tourism industries. Along the same lines as Higgins-Desbiolles¹⁰⁶³, I have chosen to use the concept of *suffering*, as this neo-liberal fetish tends to

1060 For this kind of critique towards Ortega’s government, see the articles by Equipo Nitlapan in 2008; For discussions on the ways in which gifting and counter-gifting can create and destruct social bonds, see Mauss 2008/1994, Derrida 1995, Pyyhtinen 2014.

1061 Bush 2006; Mowforth et al. 2008, 31; see also Schilcher 2007; Scheyvens 2011, 62; see also Hall 1994, 59-91; Sharpley 2014, 12; Bianchi 2015, 287.

1062 Ibid.

1063 Higgins-Desbiolles 2006, 1200; see also Hall 1994, 12-4; Cole & Morgan 2010, xvi

distract the local governments from asking *why*, and *for whom*, tourism is actually being developed. Why is it considered so crucial to attract visitors into their homes? And *how* does tourism contribute to wider social, economic, political, ecological and cultural processes in the country? Although tourism's potential contribution to development and poverty reduction is the fundamental justification for Nicaraguan governments and aid agencies to encourage tourism growth, it is clear that the benefits from tourism initiatives do not automatically spread equally around the country.¹⁰⁶⁴ Instead, the attempts to increase the welfare of some may negatively affect the welfare of others, which only exacerbates the inequalities between the rich and poor.¹⁰⁶⁵

Yet, it is not only the free-trade agreements that prevent governments regulating tourism enterprises. One of the extreme examples of internal colonialism and contradictory forms of tourism development in Nicaragua is a small mega-project called *Marina Puesta Del Sol*¹⁰⁶⁶, ran by a millionaire US businessman, born in Nicaragua and close friend with former Nicaraguan president Bolaños.¹⁰⁶⁷ The hotel, which on its webpage promises to '...indulge you with our top quality service and attention to detail in this secret paradise'¹⁰⁶⁸, has a marina, hotel complex, a driving range, a golf course, swimming pool, tennis courts, air strip, helipad, restaurants, shops, and other services and facilities for the guests.¹⁰⁶⁹ While the hotel provides spacious hydro-massage whirlpools for its guests, the residents living by the resort lack access to potable water.¹⁰⁷⁰ The land for building the resort was sold off under dubious circumstances, and the fishing cooperative that owned the land previously was left with only one narrow access point to the bay.¹⁰⁷¹

1064 Research on unequal distribution of benefits from tourism, see Schilcher 2007; Cole 2008; Scheyvens 2011;

1065 UNDP 2007, 13, 283.

1066 This is an enclave resort in Nicaragua. For more on enclaves, see Dielemans 2008; Carlisle 2010.

1067 Mowforth et al. 2008, 86-9. For Bolaños fight against corruption, see Kinloch Tijerino 2008, 345-6.

1068 Marina Puesta del sol, Website accessed on 20 April 2013. <http://www.marinapuestadelsol.com/overview.html>

1069 Mowforth et al. 2008, 86.

1070 see the cartoon *Turismo y sus Mitos* (Tourism and its myths) by Gascón & Cañada 2007a.

1071 Mowforth et al. 2008, 87; for research on the privatization of the Pacific coastline of Nicaragua, see Bonilla & Mordt 2008.

Marina Puesta del Sol is unfortunately a typical example of a Central American tourism development, where high expectations of employment opportunities and trickle-down effects from tourism have turned into disappointment.¹⁰⁷² The example has also been used by the tourism researchers Martin Mowforth, Clive Charlton and Ian Munt¹⁰⁷³ as a case where foreign investors have bought rural land and left the local people with few alternatives. Even the scenario presented by Barnett¹⁰⁷⁴ ‘When the tourists come, the fishermen learn to be waiters’ sounds rather optimistic. Allan Bolt writes the following about the case of Marina Puesta del Sol in the Nicaraguan newspaper *El Nuevo Diario*¹⁰⁷⁵:

Everybody (in the local community) welcomed the new tourism project enthusiastically because it meant work and prosperity for all. But it seems that this investor has his own vision of what he wants the countryside to look like and what type of people he wants to see there, for example he has closed the public right of way to the shore (which is unconstitutional, but which the authorities have allowed), he has prohibited his employees from making purchases in Garay’s *pulperia* [mini-store], he has tried to throw them off the Island of Aserradores (despite their land titles), and he has been supported in this dirty game by all the powers of state...

Although the people had felt positive towards the new development initiative at the outset, they had not been welcomed to participate in it; quite the contrary. As the locals were excluded from tourism development, they cancelled their previous welcome. I barely need to lean on Levinas or Derrida¹⁰⁷⁶ to articulate the immorality of a situation where guests, by abusing the welcome of the local hosts, have occupied the space, and taken

1072 For more similar examples, see the edited volume by Blázquez & Cañada 2011.

1073 Mowforth et al. 2008; see also Cañada & Gascón 2007ab; Bonilla & Mordt 2011, 23.

1074 Barnett 2008, 34

1075 Quoted in Mowforth et al. 2008, 89; And see also McNaughton’ (2006) research on the ‘The “Host” as Uninvited “Guest”’.

1076 Derrida AEL 1999, 15-6, and see Drabinski 2013, 166.

over the position of host. However, taking the freedom of interpreting his ideas, I believe Levinas¹⁰⁷⁷ would explain the unethicity of these kinds of encounters through the lack of mutual welcoming between the local hosts and intrusive guests. It is clear that this fishing community did not welcome these tourism entrepreneurs unconditionally, but the playing-field where these rights and responsibilities become negotiated is very uneven. This is a notion that has been fundamentally denied in the ideology of neo-liberal free trade. It is clear that these negotiations cannot be grasped solely through Levinas' idea of face-to-face encounters between self and other, for the spaces of dialogue are shaped equally by third parties. It requires understanding the role of those who could be called 'the Levinasian third'¹⁰⁷⁸, a third party, which in this case seems to be the Nicaraguan government and also different development organizations.

Although for Levinas politics do not supplement ethics, politics and ethics both draw on the same source – on the responsible subject. Thus, while Levinas' work represents the mobility between ethics and politics as a highly challenging feature, it is obvious that the question of politics and the political cannot be separated from the question of responsibility towards the other and, in fact, all others.¹⁰⁷⁹ Perhaps the idea of a democratically chosen government comprises the very essence of what Levinas calls being 'for-the-Other-subject'.¹⁰⁸⁰ According to his suggestion, ethical solidarity is not an obligation just to the 'other', but also to the 'Other' harmed by the 'other others'. Drabinski¹⁰⁸¹ proposes that the Levinasian third party tends and seems to function primarily as 'a phenomenology of how the political is signified in moral consciousness rather than as an actual clarification or exploration of the meaning of political responsibility'. While acknowledging its limitations, I want to submit that the Levinasian suggestions of ethical solidarity can help to understand and describe the spaces where the limitations of hospitality are negotiated.

1077 Levinas T&I 1969.

1078 Levinas OB 1998, 191; Derrida AEL 1999, 29-31; Drabinski 2013, 167.

1079 Drabinski 2013, 166.

1080 Ibid., 167.

1081 Ibid.

In the case of Nicaragua, especially some NGOs and individual researchers have taken an active role in pointing out the cases where the ‘other’ has been harmed by the ‘other other’. Researchers and activists such as Cañada and Gascón¹⁰⁸² or Bonilla and Mordt¹⁰⁸³, have sought to draw public attention to the myths of enclave and residential tourism.¹⁰⁸⁴ Even though there also are more positive examples¹⁰⁸⁵, this quotation seems to reflect experiences common in tourism development encounters along the Pacific coast-line;

They take your land for a few devalued dollars and then you can no longer get to the shore or to the land that you sold because these people privatize everything, this is the entrepreneurial vision of the foreigners (*Poblador* 2009 in Bonilla & Mordt 2011).

It is important to notice that most of this critique has not been directed towards daily tourism encounters as such, but towards those forms of tourism development that lead to social exclusion and inequality. Critics have turned attention to the contradiction that while some hotels on the Pacific beaches develop their gourmet buffets for international visitors, food security remains one of the biggest challenges throughout Nicaragua.¹⁰⁸⁶ Cañada and

1082 Cañada & Gascón 2010.

1083 Monilla & Mordt 2011.

1084 Cañada and Gascón (2007) illustrate in a provocative cartoon –like book that: instead of creating good jobs tourism gives locals only temporary, low paid employment; instead of only creating new activities tourism also threatens the traditional sources of income; instead of creating better infrastructure for the local community the infrastructure is modernized according to the priorities that the tourism enterprises have; instead of adding value to local assets tourism tends to rise the living costs; instead of helping governments to pay their foreign debt, tourism dollars end up to the pockets of foreign investors; instead of protecting environment, tourism contaminates and exploits natural resources and uses the local resources in unsustainable way; instead of promoting intercultural understanding, tourism repeats the prior representations and ideas of the local culture and society; instead of being the key to development, tourism creates a dependency of the international markets; and instead of reducing poverty, tourism tends to create more problems than solutions amongst the most vulnerable groups. See also *Turismo Placebo* by Blazquez & Cañada 2011.

1085 See for instance Bonilla & Mordt 2011, 7.

1086 PNDH 2008; Sistema de las Naciones Unidas 2007, 17, 20; WFP 2008, 2; Knapman, 2011; Cañada 2012

Gascón¹⁰⁸⁷ argue that although it has been promised that tourism will bring trickle down effects, the Pro-Poor Tourism discourse does not outwardly address the issues of inequality related to tourism.¹⁰⁸⁸ In fact, this proposition underlines the importance of economic growth in alleviating poverty, and accepts that this model of tourism development does *not* aim at promoting equality between different actors.¹⁰⁸⁹ Cañada and Gascón often describe contemporary forms of tourism development in Central America as forms of neo-colonialism and hence call for more radical efforts to disrupt and decolonize the interventions that take place in tourism sector. Through different kinds of studies, they have called attention to the risks and challenges that many forms of tourism entail. In Nicaragua, as elsewhere, it has become clear that certain forms of tourism tend to lead to a wide range of negative impacts, such as sky-high land prices, land tenure conflicts, increased poverty, exploitation of cultural and natural resources, environmental bulldozing, sexual exploitation of children and adolescents, and criminality. Unfortunately the list is long.¹⁰⁹⁰ Hence, tourism, at least as it appears today, is not different from other industries which operate in the globalized system. It tends to be equally exploitative of natural resources or human populations and is highly vulnerable to external forces and events, such as political upheaval, natural disasters, terrorist attacks and health scares.¹⁰⁹¹

In short, it can be said that the development of enclave and residential tourism has in fact been speeded up during the Sandinista rule. Simultaneously, there has appeared a growing emphasis on the questions of sustainability and inclusion and more equal distribution of benefits from tourism.¹⁰⁹² Representa-

1087 Cañada & Gascón 2007b.

1088 For research on Pro-Poor Tourism, see Ashley & Roe 1998; Scheyvens 2015, 118-39.

1089 Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Scheyvens 2011, 220; Scheyvens, 2007 in Gascón 2012, 75

1090 see e.g. de Kadt 1979; Mowforth & Munt 2003, 90; Wall & Mathieson 2006, 53, 286, 308; Schilcher 2007; Viswanath 2008, 50; D'Mello 2008, 10; Cole & Morgan 2010, xv; Bonilla & Morgan 2011; Matarrita-Cascante 2010; Quesada 2014; Telfer 2014, 164. A taxi driver in Managua (personal communication January 17 2012) stated that the road between Managua and San Carlos (which was marketed as a touristic route) was actually built with and for drug money as this is a central access point to the drug business.

1091 Hall 1994, 92-107; Telfer & Sharpley 2008, 3; Mowforth et al. 2008, 47.

1092 Cañada & Merodio 2004; Cañada & Gascón 2007b; Bonilla & Mordt 2008, 2011; Cañada 2011.

tives of NGOs and tourism researchers in particular have been demanding that the Nicaraguan government take a more active role in negotiating and making tourism development encounters fairer for the local communities. Instead of merely enabling the free growth of tourism industries in the country to continue, the Nicaraguan government has been regulating the sector, for instance, by establishing environmental conservation programmes, or aiming to prevent sexual exploitation of children in tourism destinations through cooperating with UNICEF.¹⁰⁹³ In the context of the Nicaraguan tourism sector, it seems like the negative and unpredictable consequences of tourism development have compelled and encouraged tourism experts working in the private sector to become more active in this space where the negotiations of different responsibilities take place. They have become more active in what words could be called ‘the calculation of the risks of welcoming’.¹⁰⁹⁴

In the following section I focus on the combined efforts of INTUR, international and national NGOs and development cooperation agencies to find new ways to spread the benefits from tourism especially to the rural areas of Nicaragua. Similarly to other countries of Central America, this has been done by including community-based initiatives as well as micro- and small tourism enterprises on the new tourism agendas.¹⁰⁹⁵

5.2 All-inclusive models of rural tourism

In tourism discourses the concept ‘all-inclusive’ is normally used to refer to hotels that offer packages which enable the customers stay in the hotel during the entire holiday as everything necessary is *included* in the package. Ironically the development of all-inclusive resorts has contributed to a phenomenon

1093 Waves 2005 in Atwood Burney 2007, 47.

1094 For calculating and negotiating hospitality, see Derrida AEL 1999, 19-21; 2002; If this was a study on tourism governance, I would probably be discussing a ‘space of dialogue’ where tourism developers are limiting, allowing and supporting certain kinds of actions within the tourism sector.

1095 World Tourism organization 2006 in Atwood Burney 2007, 42; See also ‘San José Declaration of Rural Community-based Tourism’, 2003.

whereby the local communities actually become *excluded* from benefits and also from the areas where tourism takes place.¹⁰⁹⁶ Therefore, I have named this section ‘all-inclusive models of rural tourism’ in order to shift the focus from all-inclusive services in tourism to the previous intentions of including more people in tourism development. I discuss the ways in which the heightened focus on rural or peripheral areas, and on inclusion of previously excluded groups such as women, children, indigenous groups and Afro-descendants, could be interpreted as active efforts to make tourism more democratic and fair.

When Ortega returned to power in 2007, the left-wing (at least by name and fame) Sandinista regime continued to welcome international tourism investors and even bought hotels for the government’s representatives themselves.¹⁰⁹⁷ At the same time, the new government subjected small entrepreneurs and rural areas to the scrutiny, unlike before.¹⁰⁹⁸ As a tourism expert from INTUR, Bayola Pallais, expressed in an interview:

One of the current challenges in Nicaragua tourism is to design touristic destinations that allow the participation of various actors in each location (2012/26/F).

Although the agenda of rural tourism development has been taken over and coordinated by the Nicaraguan government, many think that NGOs and international aid organizations have played an essential role in turning the focus of tourism developers to rural areas and finding new ways of distributing wealth through tourism development.¹⁰⁹⁹ Most of all, the promotion of rural tourism has been driven by an interest in finding tourism development which would not lead to Nicaraguan farmers losing their land and becoming uninvited, or abused, guests in their own homes.

1096 For enclavic spaces in tourism, see Edensor 1998, 45-53; Carlisle 2010; However, it can be argued that all-inclusive resorts can minimize also the possible negative effects from tourism as the tourists regularly stay inside the gates.

1097 See also Equipo Nitlapan – Envío 2008, 3-13.

1098 See PNDH 2008, 188; INTUR 2010a.

1099 For the significant role of NGOs in tourism development, see Jamal & Getz 1995; Pérez 2003; Burns 2004; Butcher 2007; Cañada & Gascón 2007, 85-91; Schilcher 2007; Scheyvens 2011; Goodwin et al 2014; Jamal & Dredge 2014, 199-200; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

In the formal and informal interviews with tourism experts working in Nicaragua, many pointed out that the new opportunities for rural communities could be seen as an outcome of the pressure from different development organizations. In addition to researcher and social activist Cañada, many directed special attention to the role of Harold Ramos, the head of the Nicaraguan Network for Rural Community-based tourism called *RENITURAL*.¹¹⁰⁰ Since 2005 this organization has represented the growing number of community-based tourism initiatives across the country. In my interview with Ramos in February 2012, he emphasized the special attention paid by RENITURAL to reducing poverty ‘so that tourism development would still have the characteristics of rural tourism’. He described the focus and the accomplishments of his organization as follows:

RENITURAL succeeded in organizing a conference where INTUR, for the first time, recognized rural community-based tourism as a core activity in order to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and also the four goals in the National Plan for Human Development in Nicaragua (PNDH). The four fundamental principles of the PNDH are protection of nature, gender equality, creation of programmes that support local development, and educational. We claim that if the government cannot come all the way to the communities, with help from international cooperation we can. (2012/30/M.)

According to Ramos, the main goal of RENITURAL has always been to make rural community tourism visible and include it in the Nicaraguan legislative framework. Representatives from INTUR invited Ramos to cooperate closely with other tourism experts and the regional tourism committees across the country in order to sketch the first official rural tourism strategy for the country. Finally, in 2009, INTUR published its first *National rural tourism strategy* (Estrategia de Turismo Rural).¹¹⁰¹ The strategy was then

1100 *Red Nicaragüense de Turismo Rural y Comunitario*, RENITURAL. See SNV (2007) Línea base de RENITURAL.

1101 See INTUR 2010b.

supported by a new law on rural tourism in order to guarantee the needed attention to the growth and the well-being of this economic sector.¹¹⁰² Although Ramos deeply lamented that the preparation processes of the strategy and the law had not included direct encounters and co-planning with rural tourism entrepreneurs, he was still pleased to reach this important milestone.¹¹⁰³ While listening to Ramos, I became convinced of his commitment to make sure that the new rural tourism strategies included the values of *sustainability*, *equality* and *solidarity*.

In line with Ramos, tourism consultant Francisco López¹¹⁰⁴ described in a newspaper interview that for the ministry and its supporters the strategy represents a new kind of political initiative in Central America. Its novelty is seen, in López's view, in its aiming to promote alternatives to the free-market-driven development of tourism. Instead of focusing only on community-based tourism, the alternative forms of rural tourism – listed by INTUR¹¹⁰⁵ – include agrotourism, cultural tourism, ecotourism, adventure tourism, sport tourism, scientific tourism, educative tourism, tourism events, health tourism, gastro-nomic tourism, ethnic tourism and religious tourism. INTUR's¹¹⁰⁶ project document for rural tourism development describes that as all of Nicaragua is essentially considered *rural*, there exists plenty of space for different kinds of rural tourism activities. The strategy for rural tourism highlights the need to expand tourism from the Pacific beaches to the volcanoes, coffee-cultivating highlands up north, lakes, and also to the Caribbean side of the country. Hence, the new tourism routes around the country, such as *Ruta del Café* and *Ruta Colonial*, have been established in order to make new kinds of actors – such as local organizations, communities, families, indigenous groups and handicraft associations – interested to join tourism development in the country.¹¹⁰⁷

1102 LEY N°. 835, Ley de Turismo Rural Sostenible de la Republica de Nicaragua.

1103 For benefits and challenges of collaborative planning, see Jamal & Getz 1995; Tosun 2000; Jamal & Reid 2004; For different forms of tourism planning, see de Kadt 1979, 265; King & Pearlman 2009, 419-28; For significance of small entrepreneurs' knowledge, see Valtonen 2009.

1104 López (December 17, 2010) interviewed by Alberto Mora.

1105 INTUR 2009a, 24-8.

1106 Ibid.

1107 Cañada et al. 2006, 7; INTUR 2009, 2010a; 2011a 112-26.

According to the strategy documents and interviews with the people involved in creating them, rural tourism development is expected to diversify the incomes of rural families and to improve the quality of life locally.¹¹⁰⁸ Rural tourism initiatives are expected to be small in scale, to employ and benefit locals through the use of local resources and to promote gender equality. The products that are offered to visitors are expected to value the local cultural traditions, history, tales and folklore and may also include activities such as horseback riding, hiking, walking and appreciating nature. Most importantly, rural tourism projects are seen to integrate the richness of domestic and rural life, with the tourism product becoming 'personalized' through local hospitality.¹¹⁰⁹ In fact, one of the key factors in rural tourism development seems to be rooted in the idea of Nicaraguan hospitality. That is, Nicaraguan tourism developers and tourism strategies emphasize the special character of Nicaraguan hospitality as one of the main attractions and resources in the future expansion of rural tourism. These discourses repeat and reconstruct the picture of Nicaraguans, of the entire nation, as a social, open and loving population among whom one finds a special 'culture of hospitality'.¹¹¹⁰

In my interview with tourism consultant Josue Flores, he pointed out the importance of the solidarity movement in the 1980s as an antecedent to contemporary tourism development:

People know how to have contact with actors from outside. You can go to any community and people receive the visitors openly – not with suspicion. The Nicaraguans are naturally good people, and the theme of amicability is very important in community-based tourism. People here are very wise and, for instance, old people are very knowledgeable as they have a lot of life experience. This is something that could also be called as farmers' knowledge, *sabiduria campesina*. (2012/23/M)

1108 See for instance INTUR 2009; 2010b.

1109 Ibid.; SNV 2007; INTUR 2011a; 2011b, 62-72; See also Rivas 2007, La Prensa

1110 For hospitality in tourism strategies, see for instance, INTUR 2009, 26; 2010a, 2; 2011a, 17, 83; PNDTS 2011, 51.

Likewise some of his colleagues, Flores argued that the Nicaraguan hospitality was something very particular in peripheral areas. He proposed that in the rural communities where people earlier did not have an access to education ‘...people do not look at outsiders as strangers, or as threats, but as people who you can treat well and to whom you can offer something’ (2012/23/M). It seemed like the idea of Nicaraguan hospitality was connected, on one hand to the idea of what hospitality scholar Elizabeth Telfer¹¹¹¹ calls as ‘moral virtue and source of pride’, and on the other to the perceptions of special innocence of people who do not have frequent contacts with outsiders.¹¹¹² In other words, the celebration of local hospitality was marked by somewhat patronizing attitudes towards the rural communities.

Although the new rural tourism strategies highlighted the special nature of Nicaraguan hospitality, they also indicate the challenges that the rural tourism projects can have.¹¹¹³ Hence, those working with the planning and implementation of tourism projects see that their role is to help small rural enterprises to develop their capacities and create well needed new contacts.¹¹¹⁴ Consultant Flores had been one of the experts actively involved in defining and developing the rural tourism strategy with the Nicaraguan government and donor organizations. During that time he was working at the Swiss development agency COSUDE with a development programme that included a tourism component. Flores emphasized the importance of the efforts that they had been making: first in creating a system of quality assurance for rural enterprises and second in enabling small tourism enterprises to register themselves. Flores explained the benefits of their project as follows:

Another achievement of this project is the creation of registration in order to legalize the rural tourism enterprises. This kind of system was lacking earlier. // This project is focused on strengthening the

1111 Telfer, E. 2002.

1112 See, for instance Pratt 1992; Länsman 2004; Aho & Ilola 2004; Lüthje 2005.

1113 INTUR 2009; Pymerrural 2009; see also Tosun 2000.

1114 For discussions about the roles of technical assistance in participatory tourism development, see Butcer 2007; Moscardo 2008.

regulatory framework, in order to improve quality and to help rural tourism initiatives to become rural tourism enterprises. The aim here is that they will be able to develop themselves into rural enterprises. (2012/23/M)

Flores pointed out that the support to new enterprises did not only mean registration, but also creation of business plans, training programmes and maintaining facilities. However, he considered the possibility for registration very important as it enables the tourism initiatives to take loans to develop their business.¹¹¹⁵ According to his estimation approximately seventy percent of the country's micro and small enterprises were informal. The president of RENITURAL, Ramos also cited the access to finance as one of the main challenges in rural tourism, but estimated that the number of informal enterprises could be as high as ninety percent. Ramos pointed out that in addition to the issue of financing, non-registered enterprises faced difficulties to sell their services to official tour operators.

In addition to the lack of official status and financial help and credit, the members of the 'space for dialogue' in INTUR determined that the small rural tourism initiatives often lacked of necessary knowledge and skills, promotion, entrepreneurial vision, management leadership and so on.¹¹¹⁶ When I was observing the discussions in the 'space of dialogue' in INTUR, my perception was that despite the numerous lacks and challenges, tourism as such was always perceived as something good; the space for dialogue did not seem to be the right space to question tourism development as such.¹¹¹⁷ In short, to make the farmers and rural communities realize the great potential of tourism, the experts perceived their role as agents offering financial and social encouragement and motivation and helping the farmers and rural communities create entrepreneurial visions.

1115 Small tourism enterprises access to credit discussed in detail in Fleischer & Felsentein (2000); see also Hossain et al. 2014, Geleta 2015.

1116 INTUR's *Grupo técnicos de Trabajo* included representatives from INTUR, international development cooperation, tourism education and private sector.

1117 For paradoxes in tourism planning, see Burns 2004. For discussion about the importance of sustaining tourism development, see Saarinen 2006.

Perceptions of Rural Hospitality

It is not a surprise that the marketing of Nicaragua to tourists includes many promises of ‘exceptional hospitality’. A traveller who plans a trip to Nicaragua can read how:

In our country you can find hundreds of species of flora and fauna which makes Nicaragua a natural paradise ideal for rural tourism and community-based tourism. Add to this the colonial towns, archaeological treasures, folkloric richness and most of all the warm and hospitable people...// ... what characterizes the ‘NICAS’ is their innate hospitality and friendliness. (EduTourism¹¹¹⁸)

In my interview with tourism expert Pallais at INTUR, she also described Nicaraguan hospitality as something unique. She presented INTUR’s new tourism marketing plan that built on the idea of well-being: or as the slogan goes ‘Well-being of a person, harmony with eternity’, (*Bienestar de la persona, armonia con el entorno.*)¹¹¹⁹ Pallais explained that they visitors can enhance their well-being by combining different features that Nicaragua can offer: its nature, natural thermal waters, calmness, tranquillity, security, local friendliness, hospitable treatment of the visitors, gastronomy, handcrafts and folklore.¹¹²⁰ Pallais had played a central role in the creation of the national plan ‘Sustainable Tourism Development in Nicaragua’¹¹²¹ which highlights the Nicaraguans’ open attitudes towards tourism and tourists:

The local population is, obviously, one of the components of the destination – an attraction and a productive factor. As an attraction, the essential element is hospitality, which means that the local population shows their friendliness towards tourists and visitors. This includes the quality of the local populations’ reception, the eagerness

1118 EduTourism; Catalogo de Productos, Turismo Rural Comunitario en Nicaragua 2009, 3.

1119 INTUR 2011b, 137-44.

1120 Ibid. 160-1.

1121 PNDTS 2011, 51; 113

of the residents to facilitate information to tourists and their attitude towards the tourism industry.¹¹²²

As I brought up in connection with the traditional dance of El Güegüense, the colonial encounters are smoothly brought together with contemporary tourism development; that is, it is not perceived contradictory that the ‘hospitable population’, ‘colonial past’ and ‘unique history’ (including the revolution and war) are used side by side to welcome visitors and investors to the country.¹¹²³ Instead, tourism experts and marketers presented that Nicaraguans are always happy to receive all potential visitors in their homes. This has led to a situation, which I will deal with in more detail later, where scepticism or resistance towards tourism development become trivialized. What is more, promising hospitality and an open welcome *on behalf of someone* can be quite ambiguous.

While I was collecting data for this study, I found these representations of Nicaraguan open hospitality curious in the light of the political situation, where the Nicaraguan government was ‘throwing’ international donors out of the country. It seemed like such open invitation existed mainly outside the political spheres of welcoming – or that the Nicaraguan politicians felt that their ‘innate and natural’ hospitableness had been abused by foreign aid agencies, amongst others. As a result from international actors’ open critique of the Sandinista governments’ ways of centralizing power, President Ortega considered it timely to remind the country’s guests who were the one actually hosting, and ruling, the party in Nicaragua. Although I cannot take the discussion here to the rich debates in development studies on the conditionality of aid, it merits mentioning that Ortega’s actions can be seen as rather noteworthy actions in the history of development aid.¹¹²⁴ This behavior showed that the hosts had stopped caring about the conditions and rules for participating, which for a long time were shaped and defined by the guests. With tears in their eyes, after three decades of ‘cooperation and

1122 PNDTS 2011, 51.

1123 For one example of ambiguity of mixing these discourses, see PNDTS 2011, 83.

1124 For conditionality of development aid, see for instance Sachs 1992.

friendship', many of these guests began to realize how they were no longer welcome – that they were no longer feeling the Nicaraguan hospitality. Or, more precisely, the political welcome was then directed towards another club of friends, including especially the member countries of ALBA in Latin America.¹¹²⁵

Moreover, although tourism is traditionally developed for and sold to the foreign visitors, the current Sandinista government have used tourism as a political tool to promote nationalism inside the country. Perhaps the new social tourism projects could be seen as a way to further internal hospitality amongst the Nicaraguans.¹¹²⁶ Indeed, rural tourism, domestic tourism and social tourism have been treated almost as the star-products of the ruling government¹¹²⁷ and the two biggest national newspapers, *El Nuevo Diario* and *La Prensa*, have regularly publish news about the triumphs and promises of more accessible forms of tourism. The articles include interviews with tourism experts and entrepreneur, and statistics that indicate growth in people's interests and possibilities to travel in rural areas.¹¹²⁸

Returning now to the rural tourism development encounters, it is uncertain who were actually welcomed to the rural tourism programmes, and in which ways this welcoming took place; that is, based on my analysis I argue that the possibilities to participate in tourism were experienced in various ways. Despite the governments' emphasis on 'citizen participation', many experienced that the right to participate was reserved to those who supported the Nicaraguan government. In general, the strong air-conditioning in the offices of Managua seemed to have a cooling effect to the otherwise so warm Nicaraguan hospitality. This became clear, for instance, in my communica-

1125 Teivainen 2014.

1126 In addition to the Caribbean region, one of the campaigns has focused on the Rio San Juan and it is called "Yo ya conosco Rio San Juan" (I already know the San Juan River).

1127 For more on social tourism, see Minnaert, Maitland & Miller 2011; and on national tourism, see Scheyvens 2007, 2011, 205.

1128 For instance, according to an article in *El Nuevo Diario* (January 14 2012) 'Approximately 17 percent of the Nicaraguan population participates in national tourism, and of this number, 12.5 percent prefer rural tourism.' According to RENITURAL's baseline study (SNV 2007, 22), in 2006 approximately 20 000 national tourists and 9000 international tourists visited rural community-based tourism initiatives in Nicaragua.

tion with rural tourism consultant Nora Hernandez in May 2013.¹¹²⁹ From the very beginning of our discussion, she expressed her frustration towards the lack of transparency and cooperation between different rural tourism actors working in the country. Her recent experiences came from working in the evaluation of a pilot project called *Fincas Agroturisticas* (Agrotouristic Farms).¹¹³⁰ The project was run by INTUR, it received financial and technical support from the Swiss development cooperation agency COSUDE, and included many counterparts amongst Nicaraguan organizations working with rural development. However, during the evaluation process Hernandez had experienced that none of these organizations were interested to talk to her. In a highly politicized and polarized atmosphere there can be many different reasons for this behaviour. In our interview, Hernandez claimed that the representatives of these organizations had avoided talking to her because the actual implementation of this particular rural tourism project had been so difficult.

Although the evaluation of the pilot project had been rather challenging, Hernandez thought that she and her colleagues were finally able to form a general picture about the project. She explained that the tourism experts who worked in the programme had been looking for potential farms and communities around the countryside, and invited them to participate in the initiative. Hernandez criticized especially the ways in which the tourism experts had exaggerated the potentialities of rural tourism and recommended people to take micro-credits to finance their tourism initiatives. She pointed out that, in her view, the idea of tourism development should not be 'sold' like this to anyone. In the evaluation report she and her colleagues argued that a more viable option would be to let the farmers and the representatives of rural communities to approach INTUR and its associates by themselves. I agree that recommending loans for tourism is highly questionable especially when interest rates are sky high and many rural tourism projects and businesses are struggling to stay alive.

1129 2013/37/F pseudonym.

1130 See INTUR 2009, 2010b, 2012a.

After my discussion with Hernandez I contacted the officials of CO-SUDE and INTUR and asked about the possibilities to see this particular evaluation document. However, I received a polite refusal – they were not interested to discuss about their experiences or to share the evaluation report with me. In fact, I was told that the tourism consultants had already left the organizations when the pilot programme ended. It would have been interesting to hear whether they agreed with Hernandez’s estimation that fewer than half of the initiatives that had received money from this particular project were actually working with tourism. According to Hernandez, the money from this project had been used for something other than developing conditions and services for tourism. She argued that instead of having real intentions to welcome tourists to their homes and communities, many had taken part in the project in the hope of receiving a grant or a loan.

In my study, Hernandez was actually amongst the few interviewees who openly questioned the meaningfulness of developing tourism everywhere in the country. She pointed out that in the cases where ‘the roads are bad, there are no real tourism attractions and the locals are not really interested in developing tourism; there should not be tourism’ (2013/37/F). In her view, it was meaningless to develop tourism if the locals were not interested or capable in doing that. Well, similarly to Hernandez, also her colleague Flores found it problematic that tourism projects had been set up with no real intentions to turn them into functioning entities. Flores argued that in rural tourism projects that are started by international development agencies, occurred a serious problem of paternalism:

In many places you can find a building for ‘tourist information’ financed by this and that project. But they are no longer working after the project has ended. These kinds of things are one of the main challenges in rural tourism. (2012/23/M)

Flores claimed that in many cases the local actors did not feel that tourism development was their own project. In development jargon this is often described as ‘lack of ownership’ among the local actors. According to Flores, a better way to proceed would be to implement projects where the

local communities were also actively participating in tourism development. His comment underlined one of the paradoxes in the idea of participatory development; that is, the most active actors in community participation might actually be those who come from the outside with a keen to help the locals to participate in initiatives that have been already planned for them.¹¹³¹

While few tourism consultants were highly critical towards the existing ‘paternalism of partnership’ in these projects, as Eriksson-Baaz¹¹³² puts it, many blamed local actors for their lack of capabilities and interest in joining the ‘joyride’ of tourism development. In an interview with Zenayda Delgado, director of a chamber organization for small tourism enterprises in Nicaragua, CANATUR, she expressed her disappointment with Nicaraguans who did not have ‘the right attitude or aptitude for tourism development’ (2012/33/F). She explained that people were not taking advantage of the help that her organization was offering. Another tourism expert, representing the US development aid organization USAID, clarified to me in a more informal discussion that most of the people in rural areas were lacking of the ‘right spark for developing tourism and being an entrepreneur’. Thus, despite the strong trust in Nicaraguan hospitality, and even stronger trust in the promises of tourism, one of the underestimated challenges appeared to be that the locals were not interested in participating in ‘rural tourism’. While there must be communities that perceive tourism and tourists as a real blessing, this is not something that can be taken for granted. My analysis indicate that although rural tourism strategies might be perceived as a way to prioritize the well-being of rural communities, in some instances the opposite is true.¹¹³³ Despite the principle of what Saarinen¹¹³⁴ calls the ‘social construction of sustainable development’, the goals and means for well-being come from the outside.

1131 For top-down implementation of participatory projects, see Pleaumarom 2002; Swarbrooke 2002; Butcher 2012; Sammels 2014; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

1132 Eriksson Baaz 2005.

1133 Höckert, Hakkarainen & Jänis (2013) discuss this in our chapter on local participation in rural tourism in Nicaragua, Finland and Namibia.

1134 Saarinen 2006.

In sum, in tourism literature and in Nicaraguan tourism discussions alike, the challenges of local participation are presented in terms of the limitations and difficulties that the local people have.¹¹³⁵ This challenge has been explained in tourism literature by referring, for instance, to the ‘...cultural remoteness of host communities to tourism-related businesses in developing countries’.¹¹³⁶ Some have taken their ethno- and Eurocentrism as far as to state that ‘[t]ourism is difficult to grasp for the people in developing countries’.¹¹³⁷ In the light of experiences from Nicaragua, it seems possible that people living in economically marginalized rural areas in fact do face difficulties in understanding not only *how*, but also *why* outsiders want them to engage in the growth of the tourism sector. However, if the guiding principle of rural tourism is to promote local participation, could it be considered contradictory to interpret local resistance as a lack of knowledge and understanding? That is, has it been considered that some might resist tourism initiatives as a conscious choice?

This observation corresponds with Spivak’s¹¹³⁸ thought of silencing the ‘other’. Although tourism experts from tourism organizations or donor agencies wish to help rural communities, their pre-planned agendas and special knowledges about the tourism sector hinder them from reflecting on different reasons *why* the projects do not have outcomes that they wish for. In my view, these kinds of situations indicate towards the inadequacy of the notion of ‘local knowledge’, or the responsibility of ‘listening to the local knowledges’. Even where an expert arrives with an interest to listen to the ‘other’, the experts’ ability to hear might be limited to tourism as she or he knows it. In other words, an expert who arrives to implement a tourism project might trivialize the voices that would jeopardize the entire planned project. Levinas¹¹³⁹ has helped me to understand that this form of helping reflects an intention to be a responsible individual, instead of approaching the encounters in a relational way.

1135 Tosun 2005.

1136 Tosun, 1998b, p. 607 in Tosun 2000, 630; Reid et al. 2004.

1137 Strasdas, Corcoran & Petermann 2007, 154.

1138 Spivak 1988. 280

1139 Levinas T&I 1969, 304-6, OB 1998, 114.

After looking into tourism experts' understanding of the nature of tourism development encounters, it is time to adopt and examine the perspective of the local communities. In the following section I move the focus from the air-conditioned offices in Managua towards rural settings where tourism is being developed. For the sake of the narrative, I take the bus, again to San Ramón – one of the pioneer sites of rural tourism development in Nicaragua.¹¹⁴⁰ San Ramón's tourism initiative is formed of four coffee-cultivating communities which receive guests, and of a cooperative union which organizes and manages tourism development. There are also other kinds of tourism initiatives in the same area. Many tourism developers from Managua have also visited San Ramón at some point; and if not, they have at least heard about the destination. Actually, it is worth pointing out that I have noticed that many tourism experts are peculiarly reluctant to visit and take time to stay in rural tourism communities. Rather, their evaluation visits tend to be as short as possible. Although the idea of the hospitality of the Nicaraguan people paints a welcoming picture of the nice rural people who always have their doors open to visitors, those who have worked with the communities of San Ramón would most probably *not* describe them as models of unconditional hospitality.

5.3 Cautious words of welcome in rural communities

‘El único pensamiento original del hombre Nicaraguense es el pensamiento mítico, lo cual puede explicar la pródiga cosecha de imaginación entre nosotros.’

‘The only original thought of the Nicaraguan man is the mythical thought,

1140 La Pita in San Ramón is mentioned in the first Nicaraguan guidebook for rural community-based tourism destinations in Nicaragua, published by Fundación Luciernaga. The communities of San Ramón can also be found from the latest issue of *The Lonely Planet, Nicaragua* (2009).

which can explain the abundant harvest of imagination between us.’

Eduardo Zepeda Enríques in Rivas Choza (2008, 8)

With these words, author and musician Edgard Rivas Choza describes the shared history of people living in the skirts of the mountains in San Ramón. I interpret it simultaneously as a critique of the many influences and thoughts that have come from the outside, and as a celebration of a special way of life and togetherness in the region. In his book *San Ramón, Indigenous and Fertile*, Rivas Choza¹¹⁴¹ writes about the oppressed, humble, intelligent, hardworking, confrontational and strong people living in these mountainous villages.¹¹⁴² Here, in the highlands of Matagalpa, in the northern part of the country, still live a small number of Indian communities, but whose native languages are long since dead.¹¹⁴³ For Rivas Choza the history of San Ramón, and especially of the indigenous *Abai*, is a story of exploitation by foreign conquistadors who came and violated indigenous and human rights. The author describes how a variety of guests have visited the farming town of San Ramón since it was established in 1800.¹¹⁴⁴ These guests have mainly come for coffee, gold, and development interventions – and now recently – also for tourism. According to Rivas Choza, many people in San Ramón feel that the exploitation has not yet ended, which makes it essential to keep alive the same spirit of fighting, dignity and love to the land that their ancestors had.¹¹⁴⁵

There have been, amongst others, colonizers, North Americans, those who took the land for coffee cultivation, those who emptied the gold mines and also those from former dictator Somoza’s National Guard (1967).¹¹⁴⁶ Rivas Choza¹¹⁴⁷ argues that those two valuable resources, coffee and gold,

1141 Rivas Choza (2008) *San Ramon, Indigena y Fertil*.

1142 Osejo Morales in Rivas Choza 2008, 8.

1143 Plunkett 1999, 73.

1144 Rivas Choza 2008, 25.

1145 Rivas Choza 2008, 21.

1146 Kinloch Tijerino 2008.

1147 Rivas Choza 2008, 7.

have ‘ironically distorted the lifestyle of the people and made them slaves, sick and beggars’. After gold was found in San Ramón in the 1820s, gold mining reached its peak in the 1940s by a company owned by English and North Americans, and ended then as unprofitable in the beginning of the 1950s.¹¹⁴⁸ Today gold mining belongs to the past, and coffee –red gold – has become the real pride of San Ramón.¹¹⁴⁹ Perhaps the most optimistic ones could describe tourism as the ‘the new gold’ of the area.¹¹⁵⁰

In San Ramón, the very first coffee was cultivated in 1852, and by the beginning of the 1900s century large parts of the land were occupied for coffee cultivation.¹¹⁵¹ The coffee haciendas, owned by people with ‘foreign names’, offered low-paid work for the locals and hence formed an important part of economic life in San Ramón. However, local historian Rivas Choza¹¹⁵² explains that while the coffee plantations created economic wealth, the owners of the plantations ‘forgot’ to share these benefits and to improve the basic services of their workers. Sharing the benefits would have been an intelligent investment, as Rivas Choza argues, in order to ensure that the workers would have had dignified living conditions, education and health. I am reading the history of San Ramón and literature on coffee tourism, and have noticed that the previous abuse of local farmers has not been acknowledged in this literature. For instance, tourism scholar Jolliffe¹¹⁵³ describes the shared base for coffee and tourism and the ways in which coffee is generally connected to hospitality in home and commercial settings. However, in these writings, there occurs only implicit acknowledgements of the ways in which the history of coffee cultivation has been based on the violation and abuse of the local farmers’ hospitality. However, Jolliffe¹¹⁵⁴, like some other

1148 Ibid., 45; However, mining does not belong to the past: A Canadian mining company B2Gold’s plan to open a gold mine in the region has faced broad resistance in the region for the risks of contamination of water and other environmental impacts.

1149 Ibid., 42.

1150 Mowforth et al. 2008; Tourism and mining – when mining ends, comes tourism. Also in San Ramón tourism has been described as the new ‘gold mine’ that the locals could mine, and benefit from, by themselves.

1151 Rivas Choza 2008, 40-1.

1152 Ibid. 49.

1153 Jolliffe 2010.

1154 Ibid., 14; Goodwin & Boekhold 2010; Harvey & Kelsay 2010.

scholars, has drawn attention to the growing interest among tourists in the present situation of disadvantaged coffee farmers.

The Sandinista revolution in 1979 meant significant changes also in San Ramón: during the following years, local communities took back the lands and replaced the haciendas with cooperatives.¹¹⁵⁵ Like the war in the 1980s, the occupation of lands is a sensitive topic that the locals discuss only with caution. Although the experiences of the violent encounters from the war can be read from detailed descriptions by Nicaraguan artists and authors¹¹⁵⁶, the reoccupation of land is a less-discussed theme in general. While I want to respect people's decisions to remain silent, I find it acceptable to make a reference to a study on the history of San Ramón, one written by a local tourist guide. In the study he expresses his lingering fear that the family who owned the coffee lands before the revolution will someday return to San Ramón and try to claim the lands.¹¹⁵⁷ The author of the study describes the current sentiments in his home community as follows:

The cooperative feels that it would be impossible for the former owners to take back the property, because every year that passes by the cooperative becomes more legalized, the families keep growing, and the people gain more rights to possess the land.

This indicates that the local land has changed owners under dubious circumstances, which many of the locals would understandably like to forget. However, it is apparent that the possible return of these 'guests' continues to haunt the imaginations of the local farmers.

The story of tourism development also goes back to the 1980s when the international solidarity movement began to bring the first international travellers to the area. These visitors were interested in helping with coffee cultivation and learning about the formation of coffee cooperatives. Yet, the groups stopped coming when the Sandinistas lost the elections in 1989,

1155 Kinloch Tijerono 2010.

1156 For examples, see Gioconda Belli 2002, Sergio Ramírez 2011.

1157 Study from 2012, for ethical reasons, I have chosen not to publish the name of the author.

that is, when the romanticism of the revolution faded and the cooperative movement began to weaken. However, in San Ramón the cooperative movement was kept alive and the Union of Cooperatives, *UCA San Ramón*, was founded in 1992. Ever since, this union has played a significant role in the local production of coffee and, for instance, vegetables and basic grains as well.¹¹⁵⁸

However, during the past thirty years or so, the life of the local communities has been everything but stable. Soon after Hurricane Mitch, even a bigger catastrophe arrived in the area in the form of the global coffee crisis. Between 1998 and 2001 coffee producers were selling their coffee at a price that was barely sufficient to cover the production costs. Many farmers in San Ramón were forced to reduce their farming, or to even abandon their coffee production altogether.¹¹⁵⁹ Many seasonal plantation workers headed towards Costa Rica. In this situation, in the middle of the Fair Trade Coffee certification process, there emerged the idea for more organized tourism development. The Central of Coffee Cooperatives in the North (CECO-CAFEN) had suggested the idea to the local cooperative union, UCA San Ramón, and likewise to an international NGO working in the area with social projects. In addition to providing supplementary income from tourism, it was hoped that the new initiative would promote gender equality by bringing new opportunities especially for women and young people.¹¹⁶⁰ Tourism was perceived as one of the few possibilities to decrease emigration from the area.¹¹⁶¹ First two communities, *El Roblar* and *La Corona*, and then two others, *La Pita* and *La Reyna*, were elected to participate in tourism development (see Appendix 1.). The size of the population in these four communities varies from one hundred to two thousand. The closest community, *La Reyna* is located only a few kilometres from the town of San Ramón. The bus ride to the furthest community, *El Roblar*, takes around

1158 See also McRobert's (2012) research on and description about the cooperative unions. *La Pita* was one the first members. They begun with 5 manzanas of coffee and through reforestation and renovación etc they have today 600 manzanas of coffee amongst the cooperative members.

1159 Vakis, Kruger & Mason 2004; Valkila & Nygren 2009.

1160 UCA San Ramón Project document 2008.

1161 For discussions on the topic, see Saarinen 2004; Cañada & Gascón 2007a; Telfer 2014, 163-7.

one and half hours. Couple of years later, these four communities were connected to the wider *Ruta del Café* touristic route programme, financed and coordinated by LuxDevelopment and INTUR. The route runs through the entire northern highlands coffee region.

In 2013, when the representatives of these two coffee cooperative unions introduced the idea of tourism development to local communities, peoples' reactions varied greatly. In my first interviews in 2008, many interviewees brought up how skeptical and cautious they had been about this proposal. Taking into account the history of these communities helps to understand the variety of reactions. Doña Hilda who had accommodated visitors during the solidarity movement in the 80s, had been one of the most optimistic people. She expressed in our interview:

We thought that tourism could help us a lot. We wanted most of all to include the young people and the adults and families. We wanted to develop the community and to bring in extra income as economic help was needed. (2008/20/F)

In general, the people who had previous, positive experiences of receiving foreign guests received the representatives and their ideas for tourism development, with more open arms than those who did not have such prior experiences. People told me that they had been doubtful about the real potential or advantages in the tourism project and found it unlikely that any tourists would ever come. Most of all, many were frightened by the idea of inviting strangers to their homes.

For me this appears as something that Derrida¹¹⁶² could call as negotiations of responsibility or calculations of the risks of welcoming. While many tourism scholars and practitioners perceive small-scale, locally based tourism development as a responsible and sustainable alternative for developing tourism, we also might trivialize the possible risks that exist in this kind of tourism. Although these risks might not include heightened levels of criminality or pollution, the so-called community-based tourism would

1162 Derrida & Rottenberg 2002, 2, 14.

not necessarily be risk-free from the local communities' point of view. The risks can be, as I will explain in what follows, dependency from an external tourism practitioners or conflicts within the communities or families.¹¹⁶³ Although the initial phases of rural tourism development do not seem to include discussions about the possible downsides and challenges of tourism, it does not mean that the locals would feel engagement in tourism projects as completely risk-free.¹¹⁶⁴

In analyzing and interpreting my interviewees' narratives, I noticed that the resistance towards the idea of tourism development appears to be a combination of two elements. The first is the fear of welcoming unknown people and ideas to one's home, and the second has to do with the confidence in one's possibilities to be able to welcome and please guests. Some of my interviewees explained how they had imagined that tourism would exist only by the beaches in the Pacific coast. Hence, their first thought was that rural communities would not have anything to offer tourists; and most of all, they were having serious doubts that international tourists would be keen to observe and learn about the local ways of cultivating coffee.

Different reactions towards the tourism proposal correspond to the well acknowledged fact that rural communities are rarely homogenous places where the actors share identical interests or values.¹¹⁶⁵ Moreover, tourism might not be as interesting and appealing as we tourism researchers, teachers and practitioners tend to assume. In an interview with a Finnish tourism consultant Mirka Sarajärvi, who worked in Nicaragua, she pointed out the absurdity of expecting that suddenly an entire village of people would start to work with a new values such tourism. As a thinking exercise, she encouraged me to try to imagine that this would happen in a small rural town in Finland. While it sure was difficult to think about this to happen, it brought to my mind Hakkarainen's¹¹⁶⁶ longitudinal research on community and tourism development in a peripheral village in Finnish Lapland, where she analyses the real life fragmentations and variations of

1163 Zapata et al. 2011.

1164 Pleumarom 2002, Trousdale 2001, 251.

1165 For additional examples, see Dredge & Hales 2012; Quesada 2015.

1166 Hakkarainen 2009, 2011, forthcoming; see also Höckert et al. 2013.

interests among the local hosts. Dredge, Hales¹¹⁶⁷ and Willis¹¹⁶⁸ likewise argue that participatory strategies tend to ignore the heterogeneity of local populations.

In order to kick-start tourism in San Ramón, local families were offered a possibility to visit other community-based tourism initiatives in the northern area of Nicaragua. The local hosts described in our discussions that the visits helped them to realize what they could offer to the tourists; and even more that they did not want to lose the opportunity to work with tourism. However, during the initial phases of the project, there had been almost no discussion about the possible risks and challenges related to tourism. This is something that tourism researchers such as Pleumarom¹¹⁶⁹, and Trousdale¹¹⁷⁰ lament in their research on rural communities' involvement in tourism development. Instead, as some of my informants brought up in our interviews, the focus remained only on the possibilities and promises that tourism could bring.

Ultimately, five to eight families from every community decided to commit themselves to the new tourism programme. Each community also selected two to three young guides to represent them. Many of the interlocutors experienced the beginning of the tourism project as a rather bumpy, scary and exciting road. Although tourism researchers Grit¹¹⁷¹, Wall, Mathieson¹¹⁷², and Veijola et al¹¹⁷³ claim that the host-guest relationships in tourism settings tend to lack of spontaneity and serendipity, according to the participants in San Ramón this was certainly not the case. I listened to several stories of how excited and nervous the local families and guides were when the first 'official' tourists arrived. In addition to excitement, the narratives were also filled with expressions of awkwardness and embarrassment. Mant brought up that at that time there were no separate rooms or

1167 Dredge & Hales 2012.

1168 Willis 2005, 104-105 in McEwan 2009.

1169 Pleumarom 2002 in Wild 2008, 73.

1170 Trousdale 2001, 251.

1171 Grit 2014.

1172 Wall & Mathieson 206, 224.

1173 Veijola et al 2014

beds for tourists and some of the families had shared their own bedrooms with the guests. It sounded like the primary challenge had been the unexpected intimacy with the guests for which the local hosts had not been able to prepare themselves.¹¹⁷⁴

Although many hosts remembered the first tourist visits as rather challenging situations, most of my interviewees emphasized that when some time had passed, they learned to enjoy the visits. The San Ramoneans sounded grateful that the cooperative unions and NGOs had invited them to different kinds of training and capacity-building sessions during the first phases of the tourism initiative. It seemed like the experts had offered training and courses which had helped the local hosts to gain more confidence in their skills and possibilities of being 'good hosts'.¹¹⁷⁵ This was particularly heartening to doña Hilda, who told me that after her first child was born almost twenty years ago, she had lost her right to be a member in the local cooperative:

Earlier I could not be part of almost anything. But when the coffee price went down my husband came and asked if I would like to start to work as a lodger for the tourists. I said 'Yes!' It meant that I was able to go to official meetings and workshops and training sessions with the other women. Before that I had never been able to do so. I have also been able to visit other communities when there have been these workshops. (2008/20/F)

Yet, becoming a 'tourism entrepreneur', was not the only challenge for the hosts. The new tourism programme had caused internal conflicts within local communities, likewise within the host families. As men have traditionally represented the families in the rural areas of Nicaragua, some of the husbands did not want their partners to participate in encounters or

1174 More on intimacy in home-stay tourism, see Hultman & Cederholm Andersson 2010; Brandth & Haugen 2014.

1175 For analysis of the importance of technical support in rural tourism development, see Wearing & McDonald 2002; Moscardo 2008; Höckert 2009; Jänis 2011, 95-8.

trainings that took place outside of their home community.¹¹⁷⁶ A few women voluntarily decided to stay at home in order to avoid conflicts. However, in 2008 one of the young guides gave tourism development encounters a positive meaning for this specific reason:

Now the young men already know and understand that the women can go to places even by themselves. Tourism has changed things here as the Nicaraguans have seen that our culture could be different. (2008/19/M)

The guide noted that young men in particular had changed their attitudes towards more equal relations between men and women. This perception was later confirmed by three local experts working with issues of gender equality at the UCA San Ramón. In 2008 I had a chance to interview these specialists after they had organized a one-day workshop for the people living in La Pita. In our interview they agreed that after women began to participate in development projects and meetings, power relations changed inside many families. In my interaction with the local women, I also heard these kinds of stories more than once:

At least what happened in our family in the beginning was that the loan was in my name, but my husband took the money that I received from the tourists. Then we learned in some workshops that we do not have to give the money to the men, but it is actually for our children and for us. This has been a problem for us. /.. / We have been fighting and now the situation has improved. Today I can keep the money. (2008/17/F)

Several women brought up how their husbands had earlier been in charge of the economic and other matters that affected the lives of their families. However, the women experienced that the membership in the tourism

1176 For more discussion on gender equality and inequality in coffee cooperatives in Nicaragua, see Ganem Cuenca 2011.

project, and availability of micro-loans for tourism development, brought women more alternatives, flexibility, and mobility.¹¹⁷⁷ The increased social and economic mobility, which especially tourism scholars Cole¹¹⁷⁸ and Scheyvens¹¹⁷⁹ interpret as a central part of empowerment, had helped the women to gain confidence about their possibilities and rights to interrupt abusive encounters. In order not to fall into a trap of romanticizing the change, it merits mentioning that the change had meant serious and series of power struggles within the families.

Besides the conflicts inside the families, tourism caused clashes inside the 'host' communities. There had been disputes regarding the unequal opportunities to participate in tourism development, to use local resources, to access the community's pool or to use the walking trails. Like Simpson¹¹⁸⁰ stresses, tourism can create serious conflicts and jealousies at the local level when different people and interest groups disagree with each other about the control of local resources and the fair distribution of benefits from tourism. These kinds of conflicts caused by tourism activities can make it more difficult for the community members to cooperate with each other in the future.¹¹⁸¹

The number of tourists kept growing during the first five years of tourism development. However, in 2008 the tourists were suddenly no longer coming. Most of my interviewees suspected that the sudden decline of travelers was a consequence of bad coordination and tourism marketing at the UCA San Ramón. The situation made the hosts worried (as I will discuss in more detail in the chapter 6): they did not know how to pay back the tourism loans if there were no paying tourists. The passive waiting for tourists made them painfully aware about their own incapability of being in charge of the local tourism development. That is, it was not them – the hosts – who were

1177 For more diverse analysis of women's empowerment and microcredits, see Hietalahti & Nygren 2014, Geleta 2015; for analysis on continuity and change in gender relations in the course of rural tourism development, see Pettersson & Heldt-Cassell 2015.

1178 Cole 2006.

1179 Scheyvens 1999; 2002.

1180 Simpson 2008; for other examples, see Quesada 2015.

1181 Although a utopia of 'a host community' is a well-used concept in tourism studies, the communities are hardly ever homogeny units without already previously existing fractures.

actively welcoming visitors. In this situation the local tourism entrepreneurs felt themselves uncomfortably dependent on the local coordinators; that is, of coordinators who came from the biggest and the most 'successful' tourism community in the area.¹¹⁸²

Hence, especially people from other, smaller communities were disappointed with the coordinators who were supposed to represent them and to work for their best. Since 2008 the situation remained nearly the same. During my last field visit to San Ramón, in 2013, many people told how they had nearly lost all their interest and motivation to wait for the tourists. When I interviewed one of the local guides, Gabriela, she claimed that the coordinators were still focused on welcoming tourism development projects instead of paying tourists or tour operators (2013/41/F). According to her, this was one of the fundamental problems that they had. The fact that in 2013 the same tourism coordinators had moved on, and started at least one totally new tourism project in the region, supported the guide's claim.

During the course of my study, many of the San Ramonean hosts' became rather discouraged to continue with tourism. At the same time, the local tourism coordinators felt intimidated and annoyed by the growing critique directed to them, and were consequently avoiding direct encounters with the hosts. In Levinasian¹¹⁸³ terms it could be said that they had begun to avoid "the faces" of the people that they were supposed to be responsible for. That is, engaging in a face-to-face encounter would have required different kind of responsibility from the coordinators' part. However, the idea of participatory development without these kinds of supportive encounters is contradictory to the idea of doing things together.¹¹⁸⁴ The ambition of the last section of this chapter is to summarize the results of the foregoing analysis.

1182 Zapata et al. 2011; for dependency in community-based tourism projects, see Goodwin et al 2014.

1183 Levinas 1969, 39; Levinas (1969, 198) suggests that 'the face speaks to me and thereby invites me to a relation.

1184 See also Jamal & Getz 1995.

5.4 Risks of welcoming

The purpose of this chapter has been to demonstrate that while Nicaraguan tourism strategies and marketing brochures celebrate the special sincerity and openness of local hospitality, these narratives are problematic in the light of previous colonial and neo-colonial interventions that have taken place in the country. According to Derrida¹¹⁸⁵:

Unconditional hospitality implies that you don't ask the other, the new-comer, the guest to give anything back, or even to identify himself or herself. Even if the other deprives you of your mastery of your home, you have to accept this. It is terrible to accept this, but that is the condition of unconditional hospitality: that you give up the mastery of your space, your home, your nation. It is unbearable. If, however, there is pure hospitality, it should be pushed to this extreme.

In this chapter I have considered to what extent previous visitors have pushed Nicaraguan hospitality to this extreme. By starting from the guests who arrived long before the actual tourists, I first moved towards the neo-liberal practices of welcoming tourism investors, and again towards more regulated forms of welcoming guests. By doing so, I have sought to claim – drawing always on Derrida's 'double law of hospitality' – that hospitality is rarely pure or unconditional but include negotiation about the risks and responsibilities of welcoming.¹¹⁸⁶ Based on my analysis, I argue that the contemporary intentions of making tourism more responsible have primarily been understood as a forum where 'self' engages in helping the 'other'. However, the 'others' have only limited access to spaces where the means and goals for responsibility become decided.¹¹⁸⁷

1185 Derrida AEL 1999, 70.

1186 Derrida AEL 1999, 19-26; 2002.

1187 Levinas OB 1998, 9-10. Levinas writes in *Otherwise than Being* that responsibility cannot really be *said* – that it cannot be pre-defined. In the same vein argue Smith & Duffy 2003, 113; Grimwood & Doubleday 2013.

Although Levinasian spaces are mainly transcendental¹¹⁸⁸, and Derrida's spaces are located primarily at the frontiers of national-states¹¹⁸⁹, I argue that spaces exist likewise within tourism strategies, practices and theories. And while the spaces for negotiating responsibility always exist, the accesses to these spaces are very asymmetrical. For instance, the representatives of the Nicaraguan tourism ministry INTUR had open a physical space for dialogue – twice a month – for the organizations working with rural tourism.¹¹⁹⁰ However, as the director of the network organization for small rural tourism enterprises RENITURAL expressed: the rural entrepreneurs' voices were not heard in these spaces. The new rural tourism strategies had seemingly not opened a dialogue *between* tourism officials and rural tourism entrepreneurs. The director of RENITURAL found the exclusion of those who they were trying to help to be quite contradictory. I agree, not only because I think it would be lovely if everyone could speak and participate but also for a more pragmatic reason. The exclusion of the 'other' from the spaces where the risks and responsibilities of hospitality are being negotiated, had in this case meant that there were no discussions about the *risks* that the 'other' is expected to take.

As I have brought up throughout this chapter, the discussions on 'sustainable rural tourism' include very little explicit consideration of the possible challenges and risks that farmers and rural communities might face and take when welcoming tourism projects, development experts, and tourists. When I followed the discussions in the 'space for dialogue' in INTUR, the issue was not brought up in any ways. However, my analysis of tourism development indicates that the local families were continuously estimating the risks of opening their doors to new guests and to their new ideas. More specifically, these estimations were shaped by peoples' previous experiences. I agree that the local actors' inadequate knowledge about the 'Eurocentric' definitions of tourism sure can make it difficult for them to participate in tourism projects in the way they are expected to. However,

1188 For Levinas' discussion between ontology and beyond being, see *Otherwise than Being* 1998.

1189 Derrida AEL 1999.

1190 INTUR, *Grupo técnicos de Trabajo*.

instead of pointing to the lack of knowledge as a limitation on participation, it could be seen as a factor that the locals take into account when they consider the risks of welcoming something unexpected. The idea of calculating risk encourages one to deconstruct the tourism experts' assumptions that the locals would 'not have the right attitude, aptitude or entrepreneurial vision for tourism'.¹¹⁹¹ This assumption neglects the active subjectivity of the 'other' who calculate the risks and might take a conscious decision of *not* engaging in tourism development.

The recent decades of tourism studies, and especially the 'cautious turn in tourism'¹¹⁹², have provided a great variety of studies about challenges in tourism development. Rather than demanding that tourism experts would carry an extensive lists of the risks of tourism – from tsunamis to terrorism to volcanic eruptions in Iceland – the experts who believe in rural tourism development could ask, for instance, 'would *I* be happy to start this kind of tourism business in my own home?'. The purpose of the next chapter is to contribute further reflections on this question.

1191 Quote from interview 2012/33/F.

1192 Jafar Jafari has called this as the 'cautionary platform in tourism'. For different 'platforms' in tourism research and knowledge production, see Tribe & Airey 2007.

6 NEGOTIATING THE CONDITIONS FOR RURAL HOSPITALITY

As discussed in the previous chapter, some of the development officials in Nicaragua described tourism not only as one of the few alternatives for the people living in rural areas, but as a simple and easy activity enabling them to earn extra income and develop communities.¹¹⁹³ The enthusiasm in some officials' voices made it sound like, to reformulate Spivak's words here, the rural communities simply 'cannot not want tourism'.¹¹⁹⁴ This approach is also reflected in a cartoon booklet which summarizes the Nicaraguan 'Policy and Strategy of Sustainable Rural Tourism'¹¹⁹⁵ in an easily accessible form. One of the cartoons includes the following dialogue between two farmers:

- Have you heard about this thing called sustainable tourism?
- Yes I have... Soon you will see that it is something that will change the future of our community... They say that there are many tourists who come and want to experience something new. And in Central America tourism has been growing.
- Exactly, Juana told me that she had seen many 'cheles' ('whities') around here.

In my interview with tourism ministry representative Bayola Pallais, who had played an important role in the process of planning a rural tourism

1193 See also Saarinen 2004; Hall 2007.

1194 In Spivak's (1993, 284) words this task is about engaging 'in a persistent critique of what one cannot not want'. Eriksson-Baaz (2005, 176) uses this quote in her research on *The Paternalism of Partnership*.

1195 INTUR 2012b, 6-7. Original quote: - Ha oído hablar usted de turismo sostenible? - Pues mirá... esa cuestión se va convertir en el future de nuestra comunidad muy pronto, ya vas a ver... Dicen que montones de turistas quieren vivir nuevas experiencias. Y en Centroamérica ha crecido el turismo. - Con razon la Juana me dijo que ha visto varios chelés por estos lados.

strategy, she explained that rural tourism was by no means complicated. She clarified that, in her opinion, the people living in rural areas must only learn how to be entrepreneurs and ‘to show who they are’. Pallais argued that rural tourism entrepreneurs must:

... look after things, make the bed, serve the food, make coffee, show how to milk a cow, and to do it all in style. It is not more complicated than that. You wash your pig, dog and hens and put the things in the right places because this is what the visitors come to see. The tourists come to see your home, so the only thing you have to do is to organize and show it. (2012/26/F)

It is true that welcoming tourists includes a great deal of cleaning; in fact, Michel Serres¹¹⁹⁶ describes ‘purifying one’s space as an act of welcoming’. However, in the light of tourism development in San Ramón, and as discussed widely in tourism and hospitality studies in general, the idea of showing your home and yourself to the visitors is quite misleading. Veijola et al.¹¹⁹⁷ suggest that hospitality would actually mean ‘opening up one’s private property and transforming it into something public and accessible to others’. Levinas¹¹⁹⁸ and Derrida¹¹⁹⁹ too approach hospitality and welcoming as making space for the other. Applying Levinas’ description of social relations in general, rural tourism encounters are instances of welcoming the other to one’s home – to the place of intimacy. However, instead of claiming that this is simple, both philosophers draw attention to the ethical and risky dimensions of opening one’s home to a stranger. While Levinas refers to the act of welcoming the Other as a fundamental task of ‘the subject of welcome’, Derrida¹²⁰⁰ reminds us how opening the door to the unexpected always includes a risk of losing mastery of one’s home.

1196 Serres 2007, 145.

1197 Veijola et al. 2014, 1.

1198 Levinas T&I 1969.

1199 Derrida AEL 1999; see also Gotman 2001.

1200 Derrida 2000.

Although the phenomenological tradition directs the focus primarily on the metaphysical ways of ‘making space for the other’, postcolonial critique denies the possibility of discussing these spaces as separate from the historical and material contexts.¹²⁰¹ Similarly, the meaningfulness of detaching the material from the social has been questioned in the contemporary sociological paradigm.¹²⁰² Consequently it is necessary to admit that this kind of home-stay and rural tourism is to a high extent based on the inequalities between wealthy, mobile guests and impoverished, immobile hosts.¹²⁰³ Zoomers¹²⁰⁴ writes, much like Scheyvens, that ‘promoting tourism means creating a world of extremes. It is an encounter of two opposing worlds: poor rural and indigenous groups in their daily routines and well-to-do gringos in their time off – each with their own expectations and cultural orientations.’¹²⁰⁵ Thus, paradoxically, in the context of rural tourism development the abundance of space without luxury has been increasingly perceived as a potential environment to attract visitors who could help in filling the space with material benefits. One might also ask whether the scarcity of materiality in rural homes becomes interpreted as an ‘empty space’ for the guests to enter, where- and whenever.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and analyse the meanings that the local hosts in San Ramón gave their encounters with tourism developers as guests. The main sources of data that I have used for the analysis are the interviews and field notes from participatory observation that I conducted in four tourism communities between 2008 and 2013. I focus on the locals’ experiences of the ways in which the conditions, risks and responsibilities of welcoming have been negotiated throughout the process of tourism development. The main argument here is that while external tourism developers aim to help rural hosts to prepare their homes for tourism, as described in the previous chapter, many of the local hosts have become exhausted by the continuous demand for improved material conditions. Realizing this

1201 Spivak 1998, 272-4; Dussel 2008; 2013.

1202 Bennett & Joyce 2010; Valkonen, Lehtonen & Pyyhtinen 2013.

1203 Scheyvens 2011, 219.

1204 Zoomers 2008, 979-80.

1205 See also Dicks 2003, 48-50; Gmelch 2003; Sammels 2014; Bianchi 2015, 292-4.

has encouraged me to shed more light on the ways in which the material mediates the social¹²⁰⁶ – and limits the possibilities to participate – in these kinds of tourism encounters. Interpreting the locals' expressions and actions, I suggest that tourism experts intend to dominate and control the liminal spheres between self and other – even when the encounters take place in rural homes.

I elaborate my argument in the following four sections. In the first, I place the emphasis on the ways in which local hosts have described the help from development officials and representatives of cooperative unions in the early phases of tourism development. The second draws attention to the ways in which the assets and conditions needed for rural tourism development have been continuously negotiated in the encounters between local hosts and their guests. By 'guests' I refer here not only to tourism developers but also to tourists and tourism entrepreneurs from other rural communities. The third section introduces an international tourism development programme called Moderniza, which can be seen as an extreme example of a participatory tourism initiative in which the guests pre-design and pre-define the material requirements needed in tourism. The participatory character of these development encounters, in my opinion, is minimal, as the local hosts are nearly silenced in their own homes. In the last part of the chapter, I bring up a relatively common issue in rural tourism initiatives: dependency on middlemen and the scarcity of paying guests.¹²⁰⁷

6.1 Commodification of domestic hospitality

I begin the analysis here from the tourism developers' flawed perception that tourism is an easy activity, including tasks such as washing your pig and showing who you are. These kinds of accounts of the simple character of organizing tourism in rural homes differ drastically from the local hosts'

1206 See also Lehtonen 2008; Bennett & Joyce 2010; Valkonen et al. 2013.

1207 For discussions on practical challenges of developing tourism in peripheral areas, see Tosun 2000; Saarinen 2004; Hall 2007; Müller & Jansson 2007; Tuulentie 2009; Hakkarainen 2009; George et al. 2009; Höckert et al. 2013.

experiences in San Ramón. In the beginning of tourism development, around 2003, most of the families did not own a pig which they could wash, or a cow that could have been milked. In fact, many families were facing problems with food security and struggled to put three daily meals on the table.¹²⁰⁸ And there are still families doing so. Although nowadays there are more pigs and cows and chickens, thanks to loans from Venezuela that allowed the Sandinista government to continue with its clientelist politics¹²⁰⁹, most of the families seldom eat chicken and almost never meat or fish. Instead, basic grains like corn, beans and rice cover the biggest part of the local plates. This includes the staple of the Nicaraguan diet for at least 1000 years: a tortilla made from dried, ground corn mixed with water.¹²¹⁰ The houses in the communities are made of wood, adobe or cement bricks and often have a dirt floor; in the kitchens the food is prepared on an open cooking fire and in many houses the smoke can only escape via a gap between the wall and the roof, leaving smoke in the kitchen. Most of the families do not have fridges or other household appliances; houses close to the main roads have better access to electricity, while others do not.¹²¹¹ A clear change that has taken place in recent years is the arrival of mobile phones, which have helped not only farmers, but also those coordinating tourism activities.

Nearly all the people I interviewed during my first period of fieldwork, in 2008, emphasized that the process of developing services and conditions for tourists was not a job that could be taken lightly. The hosts pointed out that since the very beginning of the tourism initiative, the new guides and people responsible for tourism accommodation had been participating in different kinds of training programmes in order to upgrade their domestic hospitality, and to be able to put a price tag on it. The focus of the courses had been to make the ‘holy trinity’ of hospitality – food, drink and accommodation – meet the expectations of potential visitors. The hosts had gone

1208 WFP 2008, 2; Cañada 2011; see also Knapman 2011.

1209 See, for instance, Teivainen 2014.

1210 Correa Oquel 2006, 18.

1211 Although calling is relatively expensive and the reception is weak, in many families almost all the family members have their own phones.

through courses on how to cook and serve food for tourists, how to make natural juices, how to make beds, how to clean and, in general, how to be a good host. In addition to this, the coffee communities were made what Dicks calls *visitable*¹²¹² by educating the guides, putting up different kinds of signposts, building *miradores* and fixing the bad roads and broken bridges which lead to the communities. In other ‘improvements’, the people working with accommodation had received mosquito nets, water filters and sheets for tourists – all donations from international NGOs. This all meant, I argue, learning to understand what Salazar¹²¹³ calls the tourism imaginaries – what the services and milieu should look and feel like in order to be recognized as tourism settings. In many hosts’ opinion, the first years of tourism development had proceeded in a positive and promising ambience. Edmundo, one of the guides, stated ‘The more we learned about tourism, the more tourists there were coming’.(2008/8/M)

During the solidarity movement in the 1980s, the international guests brought their own food, stayed in the same rooms with the families and often left some kind of ‘regalito’, a kind of small gift, at the moment of goodbyes. Hence, a concrete difference between these first visitors and the tourists who were coming in 2000 was that the former were not expected to pay for their stay. Actually, despite the later improvements made for tourists, some of the hosts told me that it had still felt uncomfortable to ask for money for their services. It sounded like charging 3-5 dollars per plate for meal, 10 dollars per night for accommodation and 15 dollars per group for a coffee tour caused mixed feelings of pressure and excitement. The questions of accommodation and bathrooms were central ones, as doña Hilda and other hosts explained. In doña Hilda’s opinion, the local families had felt badly ever since the 1980s that their visitors had to use the latrines and outdoor bathing areas. Consequently, the hosts found it important to offer paying visitors private rooms and better bathrooms. Ever since, the lodging offered to tourists has continued to cause a wide range of feelings from pride to anger. The negative feelings have been caused, as some of the

1212 Dicks 2003.

1213 For conceptualization and analysis of *tourism imaginaries*, see Salazar 2010, 2012b.

hosts explained in our discussions, particularly by the dubious process of financing and buying the raw materials for the houses.

Local hosts felt that the initiative for taking a loan for improving tourism development had come from a group of actors that included the local cooperative union and international NGOs. Representatives of the *Fair Trade Coffee Organization*, as part of their social project in the area, contributed to the process by helping local women to apply for the financing alone, without their husbands. Veronica, one of the women accommodating tourists described the process to me as follows:

First they told us that it would be just a small amount of money, and that we could receive part of it as a grant. They said that with every visit, and with our coffee, we could pay the loan. So they told that it would cost much less. They sent the material and they sent the carpenters to show how to build the cabañas. But when we heard that the actual price was so high, 24 000 cordobas (approximately 1000 dollars), we did not want to have them. However, we could no longer say no. And we thought that at least part of it would be a grant, but it was not. They made us pay it all. So since then we have been nervous about taking loans or receiving grants. (2013/41/F)

Gabriela, a guide who had been involved in tourism since the beginning, agreed with Veronica that the rooms had proven very expensive. Gabriela claimed that ‘...with this amount of money we could have done something more – made houses that would have been bigger, higher, better made, with more ventilation, and so on.’ (2013/41/F.) In some cases, the huts or the rooms were more expensive and stable than the homes that they were attached to. While it is prohibited to cut down trees in the local forest, Gabriela and Veronica were outraged that they had not even been allowed to use their own sand to make bricks. Instead, the sand, wood and material for the roofs were all bought from outside and then delivered, with the bill, directly to their front doors.

There is certainly something to be said about a situation where external development experts and local coordinators recommended to local fami-

lies living below the poverty line – two dollars per day¹²¹⁴ – that they buy the houses by taking ‘micro loans’, and helped them get the loans. These families, normally careful about how they spend their money and, for instance, constantly trying to save money to be able to send their children to school, all of a sudden had an entire house brought to them from the nearby town. According to some of my informants, the situation with the loans became even more problematic after the rooms were built and furnished. One woman, doña Thelma, summarized it like this: ‘But when we got all this finished – the tourists were no longer coming. That is weird and it has left us with the loans.’ (2008/12/ F.)¹²¹⁵ As described in Chapter 5, in 2008 the number of tourists suddenly began to decline. While many of the local hosts blamed the local coordinators for their incompetence in running the project, there were most probably other reasons as well for the downturn. For instance, tourism scholars and consultants Harvey and Kelsay¹²¹⁶, who have studied similar kinds of coffee-tourism projects in Costa Rica, listed the economic downturn in 2008 and even the war in Iraq as the principal reasons for the struggle of rural tourism in Central America.

In 2011, when there were only few tourists coming anymore and the revenues from tourism no longer covered the loans, the families and co-operatives ended up paying the loans with coffee beans. This was possible thanks to a particularly good coffee harvest.¹²¹⁷ The possible benefits that the office of UCA San Ramón received for brokering these loans have remained a mystery to me. In any case, according to those hosts who dared to bring up the topic, the entire process of recommending loans and helping people applying for them did not include open discussion about the risks and conditions involved. As a consequence, the subsequent development caused mistrust between the local communities and the tourism coordina-

1214 For different ‘poverty lines’ (extreme poverty 1,25\$, poverty 2\$) see for example UNDP Human Development Report, Nicaragua (2012).

1215 This is an example of a quote that I did not pay very much attention to when I conducted my first analysis in 2009.

1216 Harvey & Kelsay 2010, 220.

1217 On statistics of coffee trade, see *El Nuevo Diario* 6th July 2012. The results of the good coffee year were obvious in San Ramón. People had improved their housing and sent their children to school to Matagalpa.

tors and experts. Needless to say, the communities of San Ramón were no longer perfect target groups for the Nicaraguan strategy for rural tourism development, which included providing access to microcredits.

Another cartoon describing Nicaragua's new strategy for rural tourism presents a discussion between two Nicaraguan women working in a field¹²¹⁸:

- Have you heard that they are giving loans for improving rural tourism? Emilia told me that this loan has helped her a lot. //.
- It is true, the government is paying attention to the farmers who want to want to develop. Even we can apply for this credit.

While access to credit might guarantee successful tourism entrepreneurship, the entire topic – with its connections to risks, dependency, possibilities of corruption and mistrust – seems to be among the forgotten ones in rural tourism debates. It is a relevant theme in the participatory tourism paradigm, for these kinds of loans are considered as the best ways to guarantee local commitment to participatory projects in practice. This was an argument that I heard in my interviews with tourism experts in Managua.¹²¹⁹ The discussions about the importance of the micro-credits in tourism development have perhaps primarily proceeded from the perspective of the structural limitations which marginalized communities face in community-based tourism development.¹²²⁰ However, it merits mentioning that recent research within development studies have taken a more critical look at these kinds of micro-loan-projects.¹²²¹

Perhaps the project world depends on families and communities who are convinced, excited and willing to participate in new initiatives – those who want to participate in putting into action the plans that are planned for them. On the other side of the coin are those who do not dare or want to participate. These people are described in the harshest development narratives as ignorant, lazy, passive and lacking entrepreneurial vision, as

1218 INTUR 2012b, 22-23

1219 2012, 23/M.

1220 See e.g. Timothy 2002, 162; Moscardo 2008; Scheyvens 2011; Jamal & Dredge 2014.

1221 Hossain et al. 2014, Hietalahti & Nygren 2014, Geleta 2015.

not willing to take advantage of the possibilities offered them.¹²²² These are more palatable explanations, from the point of view of those who arrive with the plans, than admitting that local actors might in fact be sceptical, doubtful and not willing to take the risks that the projects require.¹²²³ Amid the claims that local communities do not understand the possibilities of tourism development, it becomes timely to ask, as discussed in the previous chapter, whether the tourism developers are aware of, and understand, the risks of rural tourism development.

In saying this, I do not want to categorize tourism developers as a homogeneous group; this is by no means my intention. I can see that the developers' assumptions about the 'other', and about the risks and possibilities of tourism, vary greatly. These assumptions are, hopefully, continuously reshaped through encounters with the local hosts. For instance, in 2012 I spoke with one of the tourism experts from UNDP who knew the case of San Ramón well (2012/35/F). In our discussion she shared with me her worry about the stagnation of tourism activities in these particular communities. She brought up how tourism is often recommended to rural communities, misleadingly in her opinion, as an 'easy business'. She admitted being actually surprised and impressed by the courage and faith that the local families have shown when they make the decision to get involved with tourism development. She described tourism as a risky business for small farmers, and admitted that she was often amazed by those families who believed in tourism and were willing to take the risks and invest all they had – and even more – in it.

Her observation reflects Derrida's idea of calculating the risk of welcoming; it is about welcoming the wide range of unpredictable changes, possibilities, uncertainties and guests that enter their lives with the idea of tourism. It is clear that as there are risks in opening one's door to a stranger, welcoming and offering hospitality is actually a risk that many of us are not willing to take.¹²²⁴ In participatory tourism development, the encounters between local hosts and experts as guests do not take place only on the

1222 For critical analysis of these kinds of development discourses, see Eriksson-Baaz 2005, 76-132; Escobar 2012, 192-9.

1223 Ibid.

1224 Bonney 2012, 9.

thresholds of rural communities or rural homes. Instead, tourism developers are often already inside people's homes when these discussions take place. In these settings, playing down the risks of taking a loan, or comparing tourism to other rural sectors, means trivializing the constant negotiations between the risks and responsibilities of welcoming. More specifically, it means excluding the other from an equal and open dialogue in the other's own home. This can be seen, I argue, as something quite contradictory to the very idea of participation.

One of the central issues here is the harmful image of tourism work as something easy and simple. Although it is not only the Nicaraguan tourism officials who construct this image, we should stop and ask what kinds of representations or imaginings discourses such as 'just wash your pig and show who you are' paint of the locals, of tourists and of tourism as work. To me they are simplistic and patronizing representations of tourism settings. Such discourses describe tourism sites where the main attraction would be a newly washed animal, where the tourists want to see how a cow is milked and where tourism entrepreneurship is an activity of 'just showing who you are'. The assumptions on the simplicity and ease of tourism activities are not a new phenomenon, and I am by no means the first one frustrated by such representations. Sociologists and tourism scholars have been deconstructing in detail the manifold and demanding dimensions of tourism as work.¹²²⁵ Perhaps the image of tourism providing mainly low-skilled jobs allows low wages and other forms of exploitation of tourism workers to continue.¹²²⁶ In the context of Nicaraguan rural tourism development, that image has meant that the rural hosts – perceived as good candidates for doing the 'low-skilled job' – are not seen as equal partners in negotiating about the circumstances of and compensation for welcoming. This has led not only to relatively low prices for rural tourism services, but also to a range of risky social projects.

Tourism researchers Berit Brandth and Marit Haugen¹²²⁷, who have studied farm tourism in Norway, have shown how work with tourism does

1225 See the 'Special Issue on Tourism as Work' in *Tourist Studies* 2010, 9(2); see also Gmelch 2003; Kyyrä 2007; Veijola & Jokinen 2008; Salazar 2010, 111-38; Rantala 2011a.

1226 See Schyst Resande (2015) report on *Travelife's broken promises to hotel workers*.

1227 See, for instance, Brandth & Haugen 2014.

not become easy simply because it takes place in people's homes – a place that is considered a site of privacy and intimacy.¹²²⁸ In fact, it can be quite the opposite.¹²²⁹ The questions of emotional work in private domains – the work of *hostessing*, as Veijola and Jokinen might call it – have been closely examined especially in feminist research.¹²³⁰ The process of combining the private and commercial domains of hospitality¹²³¹ by constructing and making tourist spaces in homes completely alters the idea of keeping one's home as a place only for family and close relationships.¹²³² Not only is the concept of work considered challenging when it takes place in homes, but the commercialization of domestic hospitality entails particular expectations of what this hospitality should include. This is the topic that I will discuss in more detail in the following.

6.2 Reaching the readiness to welcome

The purpose of this section is to discuss the different ways of preparing oneself to receive guests. Tourism researcher Edelheim¹²³³, a Finn like myself, points out that the etymology of the Finnish word for hospitality – *vieraanvaraisuus* – includes two words 'guest' and 'assets'. Literally, as Edelheim continues, it denotes affording, having the assets, to welcome and receive visitors. Perhaps hosts are expected to do their all for visitors, even where it means that they themselves would end up with less.¹²³⁴ This means that hospitality, and welcoming, would be not only about making space for the other, but also about giving something to the other. But how much of our 'assets' we are willing to offer to a stranger, to a guest, can obviously vary

1228 See also Grit 2010; Järvinen & Tassopoulos 2010, 309, 315; Lynch & Grit 2013.

1229 Veijola 2010; Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2010.

1230 Veijola & Jokinen 2008; 2012; Veijola 2010.

1231 Lashley 2000.

1232 Vilkkö 1998, 50 in Järvinen Tassopoulos 2010, 315; see also Veijola & Valtonen 2007, 16; Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2010.

1233 Edelheim 2013.

1234 See for instance O'Gorman 2010, 115-26 on offering hospitality to those in *necessitudine*.

to a great extent.¹²³⁵ While it is true that in the tourism business the hosts try to match the quality and quantity of their assets to the price guests are willing to pay, this is not a complete picture.

Today, when the tourism and hospitality sector has grown expansively, it has become commonly accepted to use someone else's assets to attract guests.¹²³⁶ One of the most striking examples of this is the use of indigenous cultures¹²³⁷, pristine beaches and coral reefs¹²³⁸, or non-existent laws against sexual abuse of children or other human rights violations.¹²³⁹ While there are international NGOs addressing these issues, tourism enterprises are normally not asked to justify why they do *not* use their *own* assets to attract visitors. And if they *are* asked, the demands for 'corporate social responsibility' can be easily fulfilled by launching a recycling system¹²⁴⁰ or putting together a fund-raising campaign for malnourished children in Africa. My suspicion is that during the era of neo-colonization and global trade, we have simply become inured to a business being done and profits made using someone else's assets. It is perceived mainly as brilliance, intelligence or good entrepreneurial vision, to come up with new ways to use such assets. Unfortunately, as discussed in Chapter 5, this has often meant that hosts, who are expected to offer the best they have, might be asked to participate in 'a race to the bottom', for example, to use their low wages and limited labour rights as an 'asset' that visitors can take advantage of.¹²⁴¹

The hope has been expressed that rural tourism, and especially community-based tourism, might offer an alternative precisely to these unethical dimensions of the tourism industries.¹²⁴² Community-based tourism has been considered an ethical form of tourism especially because it aims to

1235 If hospitality is seen as making space for the other that would mean that you would not have to have that much in order to receive – in fact the opposite.

1236 Mowforth et al 2008; Bianchi 2015.

1237 Johnston, 2006; Smith M.K. 2009, 29-30, 100-20.

1238 Bonilla & Mordt 2008; Mowforth, et al. 2008; Dielemans 2008; on controversies in cruise ship industry, see Wood 2000, 602-5; Bianchi 2014, 317, 324.

1239 Cole & Morgan 2010; Cole & Eriksson 2010; Nkyi & Hashimoto 2014.

1240 Pakkasvirta 2010, 3.

1241 Dielemans 2008, 149-64; Telfer 2009, 155.

1242 See for instance, Cañada & Gason 2007ab; Telfer 2003, 253-5; Smith M.K. 2009.

guarantee the local communities the right to define, control and take advantage of their own assets. In other words, those who advocate community-based tourism aim to help local communities to decide who they wish to welcome into their homes. As a relatively rare example in tourism worlds, the communities in charge of tourism development are expected to receive fair and direct compensation for their hospitality.¹²⁴³ I fully agree that the beauty of community-based tourism lies in the fact that there should be very few middlewomen and middlemen between the service providers and consumers; this is rare not only in tourism, but in global trade between the Global South and North and between cores and peripheries in general.

However, as the example of San Ramón indicates, intermediaries and brokers also play a central role in community-based tourism.¹²⁴⁴ Not only did the initiative for tourism come from the outside, but so did the recommendations and evaluations regarding the ‘best local assets’ in San Ramón. This is not a surprise as such. In fact, it resonates with the Levinasian¹²⁴⁵ idea of intersubjectivity – the impossibility of separating the actions of individuals or communities from their encounters with others. Indeed, it is impossible and meaningless to demand that communities should come up with the idea of tourism totally on their own – or that they should be able to define their assets without simultaneously interacting with their intended guests. The acts of preparing and assessing one’s local resources for tourism are continuously negotiated, not only amongst the hosts, but also between the hosts and guests. These negotiations can as well be seen as an ongoing process of evaluating one’s readiness and capability to welcome the other.

On the hillsides of San Ramón, this process of evaluation has played out through various encounters, and lost encounters, between the local hosts and their guests. Needless to say, different guests tend to emphasize, and expect, very different assets. In my interaction with the local families and guides, I have seen how the hosts themselves perceive their everyday

1243 Ibid.

1244 The important role of these actors has been discussed by authors like van der Duim et al. 2006; Butcher 2007, 61-100; Cole 2008, 30-36, 103-234; Jänis 2011; Chalip & Costa 2012; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

1245 Levinas T&I 1969, 304-6.

life, and their green mountains, as their main resources in tourism. The important things that they were offering to their visitors, according to one of the guides, Gabriela, were ‘the opportunities to interact with the families, the mountains, the environment, the preparation of coffee and the cultural differences’. Fernando, another local tourist guide with many years of experience, explained:

In rural community-based tourism quality is something intangible because you cannot give stars (as in hotels) for friendliness. The idea is that the visitor can have the experience of living as part of a family, but without having to know or worry about the problems that the farmers have. (2013/45/M)

In the guide’s opinion, everyday life is supposed to look as normal as possible when visitors are there. Perhaps we could say that hope was that the settings would look as ‘authentic as possible’, despite the fact that the guests were sleeping in rooms that the locals had invested a great deal of money in. The local hosts wanted to offer their visitors an experience that included various aspects of their domestic life. They wanted their guests to wake up in the early morning hours to the slapping sound of women making fresh corn tortillas in the kitchen. During the days the guests could enjoy cooking and eating the local food, participate in cleaning the corn, listen to the radio, play football with the children, and so on. The hosts also decided to offer travellers a possibility to visit the community centre, local schools or a baseball game. Depending on the time of the year, the guests were invited to experience the entire process of sowing, planting, composting, collecting, washing, drying and roasting coffee beans – and finally enjoying a cup of coffee on the patio. Besides the activities related to coffee production, the local guides organized hikes on the trails around the communities, which included observation of birds, flowers and animals, visits to specially constructed outlook points, swimming under a waterfall and the like. One of the communities also encouraged its guests to take a dip in the pool which the residents had built in the middle of the community. What is more, the women accommodating tourists had revitalized the local tradition of making

natural medicines in order to teach these skills to their guests. Sometimes a group of local musicians would organize a concert. And at night, as described on a tourism promotion site 'Vianica'¹²⁴⁶, the visitors had the unique opportunity to enjoy 'the fireflies, stars and sounds of nature'.¹²⁴⁷

During my stay in the communities of San Ramón, the people involved in tourist accommodation wanted to emphasize that they were always offering the visitors 'the best we have'. There seemed to exist a consensus among the local hosts that quality in this context meant above all 'working well and doing it better'. Many of the women were interested in the possibilities of cultivating different kinds of fruits and vegetables in order to add variety to tourists' plates. Doña Hilda, one of the local hosts, described the process of receiving tourists as follows:

When tourists come, we meet to decide who will accommodate them. We discuss how to receive the visitors. First of all, the room has to be clean, the sheets must be clean, and everything must be clean. We who accommodate tourists know this as we have received different kinds of training about hygiene. After that, we talk about the food. The guides help us out here as they know whether the visitors eat meat or are vegetarians. We have learned how to do the work well, and how to value it. This is our work and our business. (2013/42/F)

In my interviews the hosts assumed that the tourists had enjoyed their stays and generally found the tourism accommodation and food sufficient. Their assumptions were corroborated by the feedback and comments that the tourists wrote in a guestbook at the office of San Ramón, gave to the representatives of tour operators such as Matagalpa tours, or posted on Internet sites such as Trip Advisor. Most of the visitors described their experience in 'real rural Nicaragua' with adjectives such as 'great', 'absolutely

1246 Vianica, www.vianica.org, website accessed on 8 September 2008.

1247 For description about the atmosphere, different activities and attraction in San Ramón, please see Cañada et al. 2006, 85-87; McRoberts 2012, 151-154; or the website of UCA San Ramón www.tourism.ucasanramon.com

amazing', 'excellent' and *perfecto*.¹²⁴⁸ The local hosts seemed to underline how the positive feedback from tourists made them feel good and confident in what they were doing. However, as doña Hilda explained, there were also negative experiences with the tourists:

Once there came a group from El Salvador and they made us feel really bad. They left here and were saying bad things about us. We felt so bad because we do not have money and this was the best we could offer. The hotels have their refrigerators and everything but we do not. So we cannot prepare the same kind of food as the hotels serve! We make rice and beans and typical food here. So they left here very unhappy. (2008/20/F)

The families had received, in their opinion, a relatively small number of these kinds of 'less flexible customers'. It seemed as if after several years of working with tourism, the hosts became more aware of the kind of 'product' they were offering. I was told that it was easier to receive travellers from the Western countries who, in contrast to Nicaraguan and Central American tourists, did 'not want luxury'. However, the very positive feedback from the Western tourists is not a surprise as such. In her research on volunteer tourism in Guatemala and Ghana, Vrasti argues that tourists' happiness and satisfaction with the rustic accommodation is in fact part of the romanticized view of poverty and of the other.¹²⁴⁹ Drawing on Sara Ahmed's¹²⁵⁰ work, Vrasti¹²⁵¹ explains how living in relatively modest conditions is perceived as a sign of 'flexible subjectivity that can live fully in the global moment, bypassing the difficulties and constraints that govern the lives of racialized and impoverished bodies'. As part of their privileged, mobile position, the visitors also have the possibility and flexibility to *be* someone else for a

1248 Examples of tourists' feedback can be found from the website www.tripadvisor.com with titles 'Matagalpa tours' and 'Rural Agrotourism - UCA San Ramon'.

1249 Vrasti 2013; see also Caton's (2008, 2014, 133-44) research where she problematizes this type of romanticizing view of poverty produced in tourism settings.

1250 Ahmed 2006.

1251 Vrasti 2013, 83.

while.¹²⁵² In my discussions with tourism professors from the University of Matagalpa, they quite aptly pointed out how the locals might perceive domestic tourists as more critical, observant and straightforward in their comments about the problems that their local hosts are having. At the same time, the national travellers have less interest in friendship with the locals or in learning about coffee cultivation.

While many of the domestic tourists and tourism developers had been sceptical about the local level of material conditions, the hosts in San Ramón remembered how the success of the first international visits in the 1980s did not depend on the material conditions.¹²⁵³ Doña Hilda expressed the following view:

We think that this kind of tourism is something where we want to offer the visitor the best we have – our friendship and kindness. Before, the tourists did not have their own special room and they still liked this experience. They come here to learn about coffee production, to enjoy the nature and peace and to exchange and share experiences. The tourists normally know better what this kind of tourism is about. (2013/42/F)

In my opinion, her frustration and need to defend the villagers' tourism services can be seen as a consequence of her encounters with tourism officials who demanded different kinds of improvements in material conditions. One of the checklists that the tourism experts filled out during their visits in San Ramón was designed to help the rural communities to meet the 'minimum requirements for hospitality'.¹²⁵⁴ These evaluation visits, which I also had a

1252 Ahmed 2006 in Vrasti 2013, 83. Vrasti (2013, 83) discusses about multiculturalism, which is predicated upon an unequal gaze.

1253 For detailed description of solidarity tourism in Nicaragua in the 1980s, please see McRoberts 2012, 60-68.

1254 I refer here to *Sistema de calidad del turismo rural comunitario* (Quality system of rural community-based tourism) developed as part of *Ruta del Café* (Coffee Route), Nic/022. One version of this quality system was presented by Carlos Santovenia Pérez in *Foro Latinoamericano de Turismo Rural Comunitario*, (Fair of rural community-based tourism) 28-30 August 2008 in Catarina, Nicaragua.

chance to observe, focused on the conditions and existence of shower curtains, sinks, mirrors, soap, refrigerators, beds, trashcans, chairs, toilet paper holders, curtains, floors, decorations, sheets, pillows, duvet covers, language skills and so on – far more it would seem than ‘washing your pig and making the bed’. While the local hosts had acquired most of these things through donations and with the income from tourism, they faced difficulties, for instance, in buying the sinks needed. The criterion for ‘minimum levels of hospitality’ were adjusted in 2013 in a project of INTUR, *Lux-Development* and *Agencia Española*, the purpose of which was to make them better fit in with the realities amongst micro, small and medium enterprises.¹²⁵⁵

In 2012, Fernando, a local guide and community activist in San Ramón, was outraged by all the different kinds of requirements that they had faced during the past years. It is worth mentioning here that Fernando also had a degree in tourism from the University of Matagalpa. In his opinion, many of the products people were required to have did not belong to rural homes nor were things that the locals could afford. What is more, it was obviously not only the official criteria that guided the negotiations about the assets needed in rural hospitality. During their visits in San Ramón, the experts came up with different suggestions of their own, which included, for instance, decorating rooms with paintings, planting more flowers, buying a refrigerator, improving the road, providing hot water for the guests, and so on. Another local guide and community activist, Edmundo (2008/8/M), told me that one tourism consultant had warmly recommended that the locals should make menus so that visitors could choose what they wanted to eat from several options. According to Edmundo, the hosts decided to turn down the idea of menus, because they required ingredients for different options and preparing different meal alternatives would have been too costly and stressful for the local families.¹²⁵⁶

1255 While the hosts in San Ramón had found the quality indicator documents overwhelming and unreasonable, these documents can simultaneously restrict and limit the requirements that the tourism experts can pose on the locals

1256 Please see Chalip & Costa’s (2012) article on clashing worldviews between tourism development planners and those of rural residents living in a rural community in Portugal.

One such encounter between local hosts and tourism experts took place in 2008, when I had a possibility to join a small group of development officials on their visit to San Ramón. While we were walking around the community, a representative from an international NGO, *Rainforest Alliance*, posed questions about the locals' readiness to take care of their guests should they become ill or get hurt during their visit. She was giving a local guide a hard time and the guide admitted their difficulties in ensuring that guests could get professional help – just as the people living in the communities had very limited access to medical services. In response, the same development official wagged her finger at the guide and insisted that 'all the real tourism destinations *must* arrange possibilities for a helicopter to come and pick up the guests in a case of emergency'. Instead of categorizing different proposals as 'great', 'good' or 'bad' or, even less, claiming that the locals do not need these things, I would like to point out that many of these requirements reflect ethno- and self-centredness among tourism experts. Although the guests wish to help the locals' to find the missing elements of hospitality, they simultaneously question the local hosts' possibilities and capabilities of saying 'welcome'.

The first time I visited the communities of San Ramón, most of the interviewees pointed out how important and positive it had been for them to get involved with tourism. What seemed to be significant for many was the status of officially participating in tourism planning and development.¹²⁵⁷ This bears out work by Thomas Lea Davidson¹²⁵⁸, who notes how such recognition by the local tourism industry, and new possibilities to contribute to the family economy, can enhance the self-identity of those involved in tourism, for their work is taken seriously. In my first analysis in 2009, which was published in the same year in a research report and in 2011 in an article on social and cultural sustainability of community-based tourism, I interpreted this positive change in the local hosts' lives as what Cole and Scheyvens have called social and psychological empowerment.¹²⁵⁹ However,

1257 Höckert 2009, 74; Also McRoberts' (2012, 101) study on tourism development in San Ramón suggests that the benefits from tourism had been substantial to women.

1258 Lea Davidson 2005, 26.

1259 Höckert 2009; for empowerment in tourism, see Cole 2006; 2008; Scheyvens 1999; 2003; Jamal & Dredge 2014, 182-98; Hashimoto 2014, 223-5.

at that time I had not noticed the many ways in which the recent decline in the number of tourists had caused feelings of powerless and frustration among the hosts.

This is something that I became painfully aware of only during my later visits: although the hosts felt well prepared to receive visitors, guests were no longer coming and the women ended up in a difficult situation with their business and loans. Simultaneously, the variety of suggestions from tourism experts had made the local hosts insecure about the quality of their home-stay accommodation. It was unclear whether the success of their project still hinged on dealing with the inadequate material conditions. A local guide, Gabriela, whose mother had been working with tourism accommodation, summarized the situation aptly:

Well, two tourists in a month is not enough. The women cannot make it like that. Tourists need to come regularly because this is a job. The women have been trained, they have prepared everything and it is work that needs to be practiced. It is not fair that the women have paid so much but receive so little. (2013/41/F)

In 2013, in a situation where the entire cooperative had participated in paying back the women's loans, many of the women felt that their skills and possibilities to run the tourism business had been questioned by their own family members and neighbours.¹²⁶⁰ In a talk by a coffee table, one man told me that in his view his wife had been 'tricked' into tourism. Those who were not actively involved in tourism were now sceptical as to whether working in tourism was a real job.¹²⁶¹ Doña Hilda lamented that some of her neighbours undermined the women's efforts: 'They say that we're not making any money and that they have not seen any tourists coming here. There are many who do not value tourism as work.' (2013/42/F)

1260 See also Hietalahti and Nygren's (2014) research on the complexity of rules, logic and power relations related to micro-credits.

1261 For reflection related to paid and unpaid work in tourism, see George et al. 2009, 185-187; Jokinen & Veijola 2012, 39.

During my stays on the hillsides of San Ramón, I noticed the ways in which the local hosts valued the peer support among those who were committed to tourism development.¹²⁶² The encounters with other hosts had helped people to recognize their own resources as tourism entrepreneurs. What is more, working together in tourism had led to new kinds of initiatives. The most significant initiative was probably a coffee-roasting project, organized by a women's coffee cooperative in the community of El Roblar. Besides the cooperation between the local hosts in San Ramón, there had been few special occasions which had strengthened their confidence as a host. These had been cases where people from other places in Nicaragua had come to San Ramón to learn from the local experiences with tourism. These visitors had plans to develop tourism in their own home communities and were hence interested in asking for advice from the hosts in San Ramón.

In these encounters, I argue, the arrivals recognized the local hosts as professionals in tourism who had lots of experience of rural tourism development. When I asked doña Hilda about the advice she had given to these kinds of guests who came and asked for help, her answer was a mix of optimism and caution. Instead of accentuating the hope that tourism would bring a steady income, doña Hilda described tourism in the following way;

When there are no tourists coming, we focus on the work on the fields. We cultivate corn and beans and there also are other plants that we can cultivate. So if the tourists do not come, it really is not a problem: if they come we receive them when they do not come we have to look for other options. I appreciate it that we have several jobs and not only tourism.” (2013/42/F)

In the light of the tourism literature, it is no surprise that people's attitudes towards tourism and tourists change. Often this change means moving from positive to negative or from euphoria to antagonism.¹²⁶³ Despite various chal-

1262 On peer support in tourism, see Miettinen 2006; and micro-credits, see Hietalahti & Nygren 2014.

1263 See for instance Fagence 2003, 59; Wall & Mathieson 2006, 54-55; Cole 2008; Tuulentie 2009.

lenges, the majority of the guides and families with tourist accommodation seemed interested in continuing with tourism because they had put so much effort into it. One of the participants captured this sentiment when she said, 'It is nice to work with tourists, but it is quite boring to wait for them to come' (2008/10/F). While it is common that rural tourism entrepreneurs need to combine various sources of income, we cannot overlook the fact that engaging in tourism accommodation means, in Derrida's¹²⁶⁴ words, putting in question one's freedom. It means committing oneself to continuous readiness to receive the stranger; that is, readiness to interrupt self at the moment the guest arrives. In rural tourism this stranger comes relatively often with a gift that includes help and guidance for the local hosts. In the following section, I continue to discuss these kinds of encounters between hosts and guests.

6.3 Visits of the tidy guests

In San Ramón there have been many different kinds of tourism experts arriving with enthusiasm to help the locals to *improve* their tourism initiative.¹²⁶⁵ For a tourism researcher the phenomenon looks like an interesting jungle of ideas, or as Salazar¹²⁶⁶ describes it, a jungle of *tourism imaginaries*. Simultaneously, from the local hosts' point of view, the same phenomenon appears as an ongoing invasion of advisors, teachers, volunteers and researchers, who all have their own visions of what is good for the locals and how to develop the tourism business. Most of all these guests offer guidance about the ways in which 'the tourist' wants to visit these communities. I call these experts here 'tidy guests' – self-confident and neat guests with superlative skills for organizing the lives of the others.¹²⁶⁷ This concept was developed in a project on 'disruptive tourism', where it contrasts with the notion 'untidy guest'.

1264 Derrida AEL 1999, 25.

1265 See Tania Li's (2007) thorough discussion about development encounters guided with the 'will to improve' in the context of Indonesia.

1266 Salazar 2010; 2012b.

1267 I have also used this concept in Höckert 2014. It seems like these visitors are experts knowing what tourism is about – although they have only in rare cases studied tourism.

The project research, to which I contributed, is written up in Veijola et al.¹²⁶⁸

The idea of ‘tourism imaginaries’¹²⁶⁹ refers to the means by which individuals understand their identities and their place in the world. In Salazar’s¹²⁷⁰ words, tourism imaginaries are ‘representational assemblages that mediate the identifications with self and Other’. Salazar clarifies the idea, drawing on Vogler¹²⁷¹, that imaginaries can be seen as implicit understandings and complex systems of ‘presumption that enter subjective experience as the expectation that things will make sense generally’. In the context of tourism the imaginaries that underlie tourism are so compelling that without them there probably would be little tourism at all.¹²⁷² Salazar¹²⁷³ explains that these images and discourses are by no means harmless: they tend ‘to propagate historically inherited stereotypes that are based on myths and fantasies related to nature, the noble savage, art, individual freedom and self-realization, equality and paradise’. This means that constructed tourism settings can also be seen to mirror different imaginaries that individual subjects rely on.

Hence, in the context of material assets and conditions of hospitality, I understand the notion of ‘tourism imaginaries’ as referring to the creation of material settings which are reconstructed in order to become recognizable as tourism sites – recognized as what Dicks¹²⁷⁴ calls ‘visitable’. It means shaping the material fabric of hospitality so that it can be recognized as a service with a price tag. This improved visitability helps the locals identify themselves as service providers and the tourists to identify themselves as guests. However, when looking at this from the social constructivist point of view, as both Salazar and Dicks do, it becomes obvious that there exist no absolute criteria for what a tourism accommodation, a tourism service or a tourism encounter must look like. Or, even more, there are no require-

1268 Veijola et al. 2014.

1269 Salazar 2010, 6 after Gaonkar 2002, 4.

1270 Salazar 2010, 6.

1271 Vogler 2002, 625 in Salazar 2010, 6.

1272 Salazar 2014, 112; see also Salazar 2012b.

1273 Salazar 2014, 112, quoting Henning 2002, Torgovnick 1990, Said 1994.

1274 Dicks 2003.

ments specifying what ‘The Tourist’, theorized by Dean MacCannell¹²⁷⁵ in particular, expects to receive as a tourism service. Having said this, I would like to suggest that many tourism experts base their advice on not only the ready manuals for hospitality management, but also their own preferences as tourists.

Tidy guests tend to arrive with radar that detects things that are missing or distracting; what is more, these guests are not shy about making explicit comments about these shortcomings. On the contrary; their visits are often justified by the need for giving feedback, which makes them appear to be quite altruistic acts of helping. In other words, the guests are able to express their sympathy by offering *help* to the locals – although as visitors they lack understanding of the local context.¹²⁷⁶

However, the desire to help was not the only driving force behind the visits from bilateral aid agencies and the Nicaraguan tourism ministry. Although reaching higher levels of profitability in rural tourism is not up in lights on the cover page of rural tourism strategies, it is a consideration that is presented in the ways tourism developers talk about tourism. In Nicaragua, there has been a growing worry about how little money the international visitors spend in general¹²⁷⁷ and the hope is that all new tourism products will attract international tourists who will spend at least 40 dollars per day. In my view this magic line of 40 dollars has encouraged tourism developers to look for new means to raise the prices in rural tourism. In one example, the Nicaraguan Hotel School, *Escuela Hotelaria*,¹²⁷⁸ was chosen as one of the main partners in a pilot project involving rural tourism farms.¹²⁷⁹ Teachers and students from the school had engaged in organizing capacity-building exercises in

1275 MacCannell 1976; for critique of the ambiguity of the label ‘tourist’ see also Edensor’s (2009, 543-545); Caton’s (2013, 347-48); for variety of ways of being ‘a tourist’, see also Veijola & Falin (2014) on mobile neighboring.

1276 For discussions about the importance of understanding – or of acknowledging the difficulties of understanding – the local context in tourism, see Wearing & McDonald 2002; Cañada & Gascón 2007b; Höckert et al. 2013; Sammels 2014, 124-40; Wearing & Wearing 2014; Quesada 2015.

1277 See also Rocha 2008.

1278 Notice here also that the goal seemed to be to educate the tourism consultants.

1279 INTUR 2010b.

rural areas, including courses for bartenders and courses on how to prepare ‘Cordon bleu’ and other kinds of quite luxurious meals for wealthier tourists.

When these kinds of courses were organized in San Ramón, the local hosts received them with slight amusement. The local guide Fernando hoped that such ‘stupidities’ – as he put it – would end when the official law on rural tourism was approved and people became more aware of the different forms of tourism in the country. He clarified:

We have courses on how to prepare the same food as they prepare in five-star hotels – where they serve plates like ‘steak with parsley’ or fish. So they had to explain to the people organizing the course that women who work with tourism do not have these ingredients. They told the organizers that it is necessary to serve food that is typical of this region. The people who work with tourism still thinking that tourism must always be very strictly managed and professional. (2013/45/M)

During my visits to San Ramón in 2012 and 2013, the local hosts there were concerned about not only the continuity of tourism development, but also the worrisome prospect that tourism projects would completely change their homes and home communities. Were this to occur, the change would not be caused by tourists, but by tourism experts.¹²⁸⁰ This fear was expressed most clearly in one of the communities that had been included in many different kinds of tourism projects and courses. Doña Hilda noted that she and her colleagues had recently become more uneasy about the constant flow of visiting experts and consultants pointing out what needed to be changed and improved in order to attract visitors. She told me about a recent visit by a specialist from the development programme *Moderniza*:

This consultant came from the capital city, Managua. She looked at the rooms and said that we could not receive visitors in rooms

1280 In her study on tourism development in a small village in the Finnish Lapland, Hakkarainen (2009, 75) points out locals’ tiredness towards ‘development’ and of being ‘developed’.

like these. So she wanted to make changes in the place. She said we should have curtains, raise the ceilings and so on. We thought that we do not want to do this. It is too risky to take new loans for tourism development. This was something very strange to us. It seems to me that she wanted to change what rural community-based tourism is to make it like tourism in the cities. Honestly, it left us sad and offended. (2013/42/F)

This story was one the most striking examples where the lack of local material assets was interpreted as a lack of ability to receive visitors. Indeed, it was exactly these kinds of stories that encouraged me to look for a deeper theoretical understanding of what was actually happening in these kinds of encounters, where the guests, who obviously feel that they are helping the rural families, feel obligated to teach their hosts how to receive visitors in their own homes.¹²⁸¹

The background to the consultant's visit was the following: this particular community had been accepted for a tourism development programme called Moderniza, financed and run by a Mexican development cooperation agency. In Nicaragua the project was implemented by the Nicaraguan tourism ministry INTUR, as well as UNWTO and SECTUR (*Secretaria de Turismo*). Moderniza was based on a management system originally created in 2002 by the Mexican Secretary of Tourism and designed to improve the quality and modernization of micro, small and medium-sized tourism enterprises.¹²⁸² The programme was based on successful cases in Mexico and has since been applied to a great number of tourism initiatives, even outside of Mexico. When I was talking with a representative from the embassy of Mexico in Nicaragua, he presented the programme as an achievement that allowed the continuation of the Mexican success story in tourism also in other countries.¹²⁸³ When reading the description and strategies of the Moderniza programme, it is easy to recognize the echo of earlier *community*

1281 See also Höckert 2014.

1282 See Secretaria de Turismo, SECTUR www.sectur.gob.mx

1283 For more critical approach on tourism development in Mexico, see for instance Manuel-Navarrate et al. 2010; Jamal & Camargo 2013.

development projects, which were seen as a way to ‘transform traditional communities to modernity’ (see also Section 2.1. of the present work).¹²⁸⁴

A project based on Moderniza was implemented in one the communities of San Ramón with the goal of bringing local business to the modern, or ‘*M*’, level. In practice, this consisted of one of the tourism coordinators participating in Moderniza course meetings in Managua, the capital city. After every meeting, as the coordinator herself described it, she was expected to help the local entrepreneurs to go through modifications that would turn rural homes into hotel-restaurants. The local coordinator, just like the local hosts in the community, found this process to be both overwhelming and frustrating. The course required fast and expensive changes which were not possible – or meaningful – in this context. Although the local coordinator tried to describe the local realities to the consultants responsible for the course in Managua, they experts continued to demand results. The local coordinators felt that the entire Moderniza system was designed for bigger companies that would have the capital to make the needed investments. That is, the project was not suitable for the people living in the communities of San Ramón, who were still having nightmares about their earlier difficulties in paying back their loans.

The main importance of this project, according to the local coordinator, was the improved contact between the UCA San Ramón office and the particular community in which the project was run. Although the coordinator was working as a broker between the Moderniza project and rural homes, she seemingly took the side of the community. While she tried to adjust the programme to local realities that the families were living, she found this task very difficult. Furthermore, some of the local guides openly ridiculed the entire project: the local guide Fernando wondered, with an ironical tone in his voice, whether I knew how high ceilings the tourists were normally expecting. His comment supports my impression that this particular project could easily be included in some of the satires or parodies of top-down approaches to development aid. Such comedies have been recently written, for

1284 See Berkhöfer & Berkhöfer 2007, 234; Greig et al. 2007, 234; Midgley 2011, 174.

instance, in the Kenyan context.¹²⁸⁵ The campaign ‘Radiators for Norway’ is another example of this healthy trend of questioning the perceptions of helping ‘the-other-in-need’ to help him- or herself through pre-planned projects or charity campaigns.¹²⁸⁶ The upshot here is that there exists a need to ask in which ways our representations of the ‘poor other’ continue to shape the future encounters between ourselves.¹²⁸⁷

In San Ramón the visit of Moderniza consultant – described in the quotation above – sparked a spirited discussion in the community. Doña Hilda, who had told me about her fear of tourism changing her community, summed up the general feeling in the community as follows:

We have thought that if visitors do not come, we must accept it. And we have now said to our local tourism coordinators that this particular consultant is no longer *welcome* here. We do not want to receive her here. (2013/42/F)

In other words, the local hosts had decided to explicitly cancel their welcome to this tourism expert. Or perhaps the comment meant cancelling their invitation to all tourism experts who seemed to arrive with the same kinds of attitudes and intentions.¹²⁸⁸ Although they had finally received the diploma with a blue ‘M’ as recognition of ‘modernization’, the diploma was now hidden in one of the drawers at the office of UCA San Ramón. It seemed like nobody

1285 See the series of *The Samaritans* on a dysfunctional, fictitious NGO in the Kenya field office, where ‘the cosmopolitan staff deal with the strange demands and decisions of UK headquarters and hopelessly inept local bureaucracies, all under the guise of ‘Saving Africa’’. Source: aidforaid.com, website accessed in 15 August 2015.

1286 For an insightful example of postcolonial analysis and action see video clips, such ‘Radi-Aid’ and ‘Let’s Save Africa – Gone Wrong’ by The Norwegian Students’ and Academics’ International Assistance Fund. Their ‘Africa for Norway’ campaign encourages all the Africans to save Norwegians from dying of frostbite. Their slogan goes: ‘You too can donate your radiator and spread some warmth!’ Their latest video ‘Who wants to be a volunteer’ (a modified version of ‘Who wants to be a millionaire’) offers an entertaining chance to question one’s perceptions about volunteer tourism by telling a story of Lilly, who wants to ‘save Africa’. Source: <http://www.africafornorway.no/why> website accessed on 14 December 2014.

1287 For postcolonial discourses and representations, see Caton & Santos 2009; McEwan 2009, 120–64; Vrasti 2013.

1288 See Dauzat et al. 1971 in Järvinen-Tessapoulos 2010, 311.

was desperate to receive acknowledgement for participating in this development course for modern tourism enterprises. Instead, the local hosts seemed more proud of their common decision to not raise the ceilings and to declare the ‘consultant from Managua’ a ‘persona non grata’. I was myself impressed by their determination and straightforwardness in this matter; I interpreted it as a concrete step in taking a more active role in the space where the conditions of welcoming were negotiated. In other words, the local hosts had made an active choice to *not* participate in these kinds of participatory projects.

During my last fieldwork in San Ramón in 2013, I noticed that the local hosts talked about these kinds of ‘tidy guests’ almost as uninvited guests.¹²⁸⁹ An important theme in many discussions and interviews was the fact that the local hosts no longer trusted and respected these kinds of guests in the same way as they had before. One of the guides, Gabriela, explained that they had become more suspicious towards their ‘helpers’ and seriously doubted whether they could any longer learn anything from the experts. She was furious that the people working with tourism and receiving a monthly paid salary in tourism projects had, in her opinion, neither education in tourism nor interest in learning about the field. It seemed to me that, just like Gabriela, many people had become tired of the rude guests, who arrived with no respect for the locals either as people who opened their homes or as tourism professionals with knowledge and experience of tourism.

It is good to stop here to reflect about the paradoxes in the host-guest relations between locals and experts. In one way tourism experts tend to take the role of a host, welcoming the people in rural communities to participate in development and research projects and in the tourism industry at large. These experts – or maybe I could say *we* – arrive with good intentions to lower the threshold for rural communities to enter tourism markets. It is as if the tourism specialists from the outside were saying ‘*Yes, welcome to participate in tourism*’ but then continuously reminding the locals of their otherness and inadequacy.¹²⁹⁰ In the case of San Ramón, some of the experts

1289 See Höckert 2014; see also Goodwin et al. 2014.

1290 Please see Mireille Rosello’s *Postcolonial Hospitality* (2001) where she discusses about the refugees who are welcomed and then reminded of their otherness. See also Kuokkanen (2007) on the ways universities remind indigenous people of their otherness.

even claimed that the locals were not fulfilling the basic conditions for inviting guests into their home and saying ‘welcome’. Levinas and Derrida help to point out the unethicity of encounters where, first, welcome is based on conditions, secondly, the conditions for welcoming are based on others’ difference and, thirdly, the other’s right to say ‘welcome’ becomes denied. It is clear that their idea of unconditionally open welcoming – the law of hospitality – is a utopia that none of the parties here could live up to. However, while the experts sought to help the locals to participate in tourism development, they also kept the locals in the position of guests, that is, the same people who are assumed to be hosts in their homes and home communities. Could it be that the privileged position of an expert can easily lead to her or his claiming sovereignty over the role of the host?

In the Levinasian idea of welcoming encounter, the roles of host and guest are in constant change, meaning that the host (*hôte*) becomes also the guest (*hôte*).¹²⁹¹ This means that striving for more ethical encounters between self and other would require, in Rosello’s¹²⁹² words, ‘a continuum between hosting and guesting’. Although Levinas himself underlines the asymmetry in welcoming, I feel that the inseparability of hosting and guesting derives from the idea of participation as such. Just like hospitality, participation cannot bloom with one host who always says welcome and dominates the guests.¹²⁹³ I think Kuokkanen¹²⁹⁴, in her research on hospitality in academia, puts it well when she writes:

There are many hosts, and they are all different. There are many entities that can and do say welcome, but the welcomes of these different hosts mean and imply different things. They may all be important, but that does not mean that they are necessarily equal or that they have the same access to institutional resources and discourses. There is the initial hospitality, and there are the initial hosts who continue to be hosts, even if at times it may appear that they have been erased

1291 Derrida AEL 1999, 19-21; 41-2.

1292 Rosello 2001, 18.

1293 Kuokkanen 2007, 138.

1294 Ibid.

or become the hostage of the *hosti-pet-s*, the guest-master through benevolent imperialism, epistemic ignorance, repressive tolerance, and other mechanisms of control and domination.

I find this to be a good reminder of Levinas' idea that the subject is a host – and a guest. Actually, the way in which some of the tourism experts in San Ramón undermined the local hosts' possibilities to host empowered the local women to claim their subjectivity as hosts who could set the conditions for their welcome. As a consequence of the experts' eagerness to take on the role of host in local homes, the local hosts decided to make their welcome more conditional. This decision is consistent with Kuokkanen's claim that the master-guest does not deserve to receive hospitality or to say 'welcome'. Extending this thought to the larger scale of participatory projects, it can be asked whether experts who dominate the hosting deserve to say 'welcome' or to call their work participatory.

In the communities of San Ramón, the encounters between local hosts and their 'tidy guests' became less hospitable when the years passed by. Although in the beginning there had been a promise of a minimum number of conditions and limitations for participating in tourism, in many hosts' opinions, the requirements became unreasonable and unbearable as the years went on. What is more, after several years of capacity-building exercises, courses and improvement of material conditions, the participants felt that they were still not treated or heard as tourism professionals. In other words, their experiences and different modes of knowing about tourism and welcoming tourists were silenced in their encounters with the tourism experts. Adapting Spivak's¹²⁹⁵ notion of 'epistemic violence', this silencing could be called 'domestic-epistemic-violence'. It was something that could be called as violence also in Levinasian terms, as the locals felt that they became categorized as something deficient.¹²⁹⁶ As a result, it had become more difficult for the participants to enjoy their encounters with their guests

1295 Spivak 1988, 281. By epistemic violence Spivak refers, for instance, to destructive attempts to understand subaltern classes only in terms of their adequation to European models (McEwan 2009, 68).

1296 Levinas T&I 1969, 180-2; see also Kallio Tavin 2013.

in the same way as they had done before. This form of epistemic violence can be even more exasperating as the act of silencing takes place in people's own physical homes – not only in the metaphysical and discursive spheres between self and the other. However, an interesting question arises here: Can the locals' resistance to external criticism and evaluation be seen as a sign of empowerment?

It is difficult for me to imagine that such a strategy would have been deliberate. At least I have never come across a community-development strategy or gender equality project titled *Empowerment via critique and humiliation*. To put it differently, I doubt that participatory tourism plans include an implicit strategy of belittling the local entrepreneurs until they become empowered to resist the participatory projects. Luckily I had a chance to bring up this question in October 2013 when I attended a conference called *Local communities, promise or burden in sustainable rural tourism development?*¹²⁹⁷ Before going to my actual question, I must point out that the title of the conference – and the conference as such – included a rather robust assumption about the role of tourism in rural areas. In this approach to rural tourism, in Hakkarainen's, Jänis' and my view, the well-being of local communities is deemed secondary to the aims of developing tourism.¹²⁹⁸ I was delighted when tourism geographer Saarinen also discreetly challenged the assumption in his keynote speech at the conference.¹²⁹⁹

Another keynote speaker in this conference was Harold Goodwin¹³⁰⁰, who is not only a preeminent scholar in the area of responsible tourism, but also one of the few, outspoken critics of community-based tourism. After his presentation I caught myself reaching eagerly for the microphone that was circulated in the audience. I was excited to hear whether Goodwin could consider rural communities as 'empowered' in settings where the local resi-

1297 Conference on *Communities as a part of sustainable rural tourism – success factor or inevitable burden?* was organized between 9-10. September 2013 in a Finnish coastal town called Kotka.

1298 Höckert et al. 2013, 167.

1299 See also Saarinen (2006) on *Traditions of Sustainability in Tourism*. Saarinen's (10 September 2013) keynote in the conference 'The role of communities in rural tourism and rural development.

1300 Goodwin 2012, Goodwin et al. 2012. Goodwin's (11 September 2013) keynote in the conference was titled 'It is not Tourism until it is sold: commercializing community based tourism'.

dents openly resisted social projects that had been planned *for* them. In the course of my question I asked whether this kind of capability of resistance could be seen as one of the goals of emancipatory empowerment projects. However, Goodwin rejected the possibility and meaningfulness of such a tactic of reverse empowerment. In his view, the most serious consequence of such a series of actions is that it can harm people's self-esteem, making it more difficult for them to shape the things that affect their well-being.¹³⁰¹ I agree. Based on my observations and analysis of tourism development in San Ramón, I have become convinced of the importance of acknowledging the consequences that might follow if projects 'fail'.

Developing the world – and especially developing world through projects – includes a risk that any resistance to pre-planned projects becomes trivialized or silenced.¹³⁰² In the case of San Ramón, the local coordinators and tourism experts interpreted local resistance as lack of motivation or entrepreneurial vision instead of meeting locals as active subjects who calculate their risks of welcoming. Following Derrida's¹³⁰³ 'double-law-of-hospitality', this calculation of risks is an unescapable part of hospitality between self and other. However, in the settings that take place in San Ramón, the locals are set to play a fixed role of passive receivers who are to a large extent incapable of calculating risks and shaping their conditions of hospitality based on those calculations. What is more, the visits of development officials have seemingly made the hosts' attitudes more hostile, or at least less open, towards their guests. I want to make it clear that I am not interested about making statements about who knows more about adequate material conditions in tourism and hospitality industries. Instead, my main concern here is the ways in which these encounters between locals and tourism experts lack open dialogue about different views.¹³⁰⁴ The consequences of

1301 For discussions on social empowerment within tourism, see Höckert 2011; Jamal & Dredge 2014, 188-90, 198; Hashimoto 2014; For resistance in tourism, see Mettiäinen et al 2009, 226-37; Pleumarom 2012; Sammels 2014, 130-1; For resistance of aid, see Escobar 2012, 215-17; Seppälä 2013.

1302 Sharpe & Spivak 2002; Kapoor 2004; Eriksson Baaz 2005.

1303 Derrida 2000, 75-83.

1304 Kapoor 2004; Eriksson Baaz 2005.

this should not be taken lightly, for the pre-conceptions and opinions that the experts carry with them often turn into knowledge.¹³⁰⁵ The risk of this happening in rural tourism development is evident, as the ‘mobile’ guests’ openness towards the ‘immobile’ locals is limited by the guests’ imaginaries on what ‘tourism is supposed to look like’.¹³⁰⁶

These risks could be diminished if the guests did their ‘homework’, as Kuokkanen¹³⁰⁷ calls it, prior to heading to the field and to visit the others. The purpose of this homework would be to acknowledge and address the possible limitations on open encounters between self and the other. Drawing on Spivak, Kuokkanen¹³⁰⁸ describes the content of this homework as ‘critical examination of one’s beliefs, biases, and assumptions as well as an understanding of how they have developed in the first place’. When the homework is forgotten – or eaten by the family dog – engagement in emancipatory projects includes a great risk of unconsciously re-constructing the unequal power relations between self and the other. Kuokkanen¹³⁰⁹ argues that responsibility links consciousness with conscience. She underlines the inadequacy of knowing one’s responsibilities without being aware of the consequences of one’s actions. Lack of such awareness produces an arrogant ‘clean conscience’, readily seen in a privileged academic, development expert or a volunteer worker, all of whom can afford to be indifferent and not-knowing.

Guests who highlight the lack of material resources amongst hosts can worsen the feelings of ‘relative deprivation’, as tourism researchers express it.¹³¹⁰ However, feelings of relative deprivation are normally seen as a consequence of the interactions between locals and tourists, not of the visits with tourism developers. In fact the potential for disappointment in cross-cultural encounters between development brokers and local people

1305 See Veijola 1997; Sharpe & Spivak 2002.

1306 For tourism imaginaries, see Salazar 2010, 2012b; for immobility of the ‘other’, see Vrasti 2013, 83; and also Ahmed 2000 172.

1307 Kuokkanen 2007, 117.

1308 Ibid, 115.

1309 Ibid.

1310 Swarbrooke 2002, 73-4; Höckert 2009, 86-90; Scheyvens 2011.

is a widely acknowledged challenge in development studies.¹³¹¹ In any case, in San Ramón it seemed like some of the tourism experts had come with a duty-list that included the task of making the locals feel bad about their slow material progress and things that they were lacking in their homes. While my intentions here are by no means to trivialize the material needs that the people living in San Ramón might have, I want to question the meaningfulness of placing the priority on the needs of visitors who might end up never coming.¹³¹²

In sum, although ‘relative deprivation’ calls for discussion about the unequal nature of tourism encounters, understanding experiences of inequality requires a wider range of conceptualizations and approaches. For instance, continuous questioning and evaluation of hosts’ capability to welcome guests can have various consequences. In San Ramón this has led, at least partly, to lack of motivation when it comes to waiting for and receiving guests. Many of the local hosts have experienced the requirements for material conditions as an endless list of demands that they will never be able to meet. In other words, this narrative of tourism development keeps constructing them as hosts and entrepreneurs who are somehow always, if not failing, at least inadequate.

6.4 Missing encounters

In the very beginning of tourism activities, local families felt uncomfortable about receiving money for their hospitality. But when some time had passed, the hosts started to see tourism and hosting as their livelihood and expected visitors to pay for the services. Yet, although the prices for tourism services were clearly presented on the website of UCA San Ramón¹³¹³, it

1311 Eriksson Baaz 2005; McEwan 2009, 218–24.

1312 see also Wearing & McDonald 2002.

1313 The pricelist that can be found from the San Ramón web-page (accessed 23/3/2014)

* Lodging with family incl. breakfast per night per person: \$12

* Lodging at the Eco-Albergue in La Pita per night per person: \$15

* Breakfast per person: \$3.5 / Lunch per person: \$5 / Dinner per person: \$4

* A local tourist guide per day per group: \$15 / Tour to Solcafé per person: \$5

* Entrance to the finca per person: \$2 / Using the pool: \$2

was not always clear whether a walk with a local guide was part of a guided tour or just a chat on the way to the town of San Ramón.¹³¹⁴ It also was unclear whether participation in local life meant eating with the families, or also observing how one's host family was struggling to cope with a semi-alcoholic family member. The limits between backstage and frontstage are evidently blurry in tourism encounters that take place in people's homes.¹³¹⁵ The blurriness between private and professional domains of hospitality can also be approached with Derrida's¹³¹⁶ idea of constant negotiation between conditional and unconditional hospitality. If unconditional hospitality means allowing the other to enter one's place of intimacy – backstage – conditional hospitality denotes an intention on the part of the host to limit the guests' access to backstage. However, just like in other spheres of hospitality, these negotiations cannot be pre-designed.¹³¹⁷

Based on my interactions with the local hosts in San Ramón I could say that this constant negotiation between welcoming and closing doors did not bother the hosts particularly much in cases where tourists arrived as paying guests. With time, as some of the hosts explained to me, they learned to handle even difficult questions about gender equality, religion, Nicaraguan politics, war, as well as more detailed inquiries about coffee production, demographics and so on. These answers were obviously not pre-planned but rather the discussions always took on different forms with different guests.¹³¹⁸

An important issue that emerged in my interviews already in 2008, and even more in 2013 was the arrival of those guests who were not aware that

* Workshop to learn how to make traditional food per group: \$40 / Workshop with natural, traditional medicine per group: \$40 / Cultural activities (games, music, dancing) per group: \$60

* Prices for volunteering at UCA San Ramón, Package 1 (3 months): Three meals per day, lodging, talks about the coffee, etc., access to Internet, paper, free use of a bike. Price: US\$ 1050

1314 Gmelch 2003; Salazar 2010.

1315 The issue of backstage and frontstage in tourism was originally introduced by MacCannell 1976, and thereafter applied and discussed further by scholars on home-stay tourism, such as Lynch, McIntosh & Tucker 2009; Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2010.

1316 Derrida AEL 1999, 75-80; 2002; Baker 2010.

1317 Derrida 2000.

1318 For more detail on coffee table conversations, see Höckert 2009; 2014.

one had to pay for tourism services, or did not want to pay for them or could not afford to do so. For instance, in one of the interviews doña Hilda told me about travellers who came, ate one meal and wanted to sleep on the patio – for free – without occupying the room built for the visitors. In my discussions with the local guides Alexis, Gabriela and Fernando, I heard stories about visitors who refused to pay for what they regarded as relatively rustic accommodation. There were also those who entered a community by themselves, walked on the tracks, took pictures and left. One of the guides, Gabriela, explained:

We feel bad if people come here without us and without control because in practice the cooperative is the owner of this area. They should respect that the fact that this is private property, but they do not show respect to this place and to us. They just march in without a guide and go to the mountains. Sometimes even other guides bring tourists here without our permission. (2008/16/F.)

The most striking cases, in the guides' opinion, were occasions where a group of travellers came into the area with their own guide, had a good look at the local life and nature, ate their own food and left without leaving any compensation to the local community. The guides told me that after these kinds of experiences they had considered it timely to call a meeting in each community to discuss common rules for tourists.¹³¹⁹ In these meetings the active local participants in tourism had agreed on the principle that tourists should always walk in the communities with the local guides. Gabriela clarified: 'We decided that every foreign person has to pay US\$1 and Nicaraguans 10 Cordobas [approximately 50 cents] through here.' (2008/16/F.) By doing this we try to control the people who come through here.' Additionally, they defined more clearly those areas in the communities where the visitors were allowed to enter, and which areas were only for the people living in the community. For instance, the hosts felt it was important to respect

1319 For importance of codes of conduct in local communities, see also Ashley & Roe 1998, 36; Dowling, 2003, 214; Wearing & Wearing 2014.

the privacy of those community members who resisted the idea of tourism in their home community. To point out the obvious, not all community members had been happy with the tourism projects.

What is more, some of the local guides approached the tourism coordinators in San Ramón and asked them to try to keep away intrusive or unwelcomed guests out, that is, guests who did not show respect for the local tourism initiative and the rules by which it worked. The local guides seemed proud of and determined to implement the codes of conduct that they had been putting together. It was a sign that they were able to define and decide on their own conditions of welcoming. In the words of Derrida¹³²⁰, their welcome was by no means unconditional, and in Levinasian¹³²¹ terms the local hosts could have been considered unethical. However, Levinas' idea of infinitely open welcoming means welcoming in a home that is not a property and cannot be owned. Hence, opening one's home completely to a stranger would require readiness to become a guest in one's home. But can it be considered unethical if the hosts set rules for their welcome? Could it be said that the local hosts in San Ramón had seen it as their responsibility to protect their homes from those who did not acknowledge and respect the locals' hospitality? From the guests who had taken for granted that the locals say 'welcome'? Or, even worse, from those who had not even recognized the local hosts as hosts? In fact the above-mentioned conditions for unpaying guests were among the first codes of conduct that the locals compiled. Later on they continued to protect the borders of their community, and the thresholds of their homes, from researchers, students (see 4.2.), as well as tidy guests, who they had considered intruding or rude (see 6.3.). Interestingly, community-based tourism had turned into efforts on the part of the communities to control access to the community. At the same time, nearly all the local hosts whom I interviewed during my last visit were warmly welcoming visitors who stayed for several days and paid fairly for the local services they used during their stay.

1320 Derrida AEL 1999; 2000.

1321 Levinas T&I 1969.

For me the phenomenon whereby tourists and travellers try to avoid paying for the services described above is simultaneously irritating and fascinating.¹³²² It is by no means a unique phenomenon that takes place only in the Nicaraguan countryside. I will always remember one sustainable tourism workshop where a Finnish ecotourism entrepreneur decided to open her heart about tourism developers and tourists.¹³²³ She told us that she was exhausted and outraged not only by EU regulations and municipality clerks, but also by visitors and neighbours who did not recognize her as an entrepreneur. The visitors, as she explained it, tended to arrive at her farm with their own picnic baskets and wanting to pet and feed the animals for free. When the entrepreneur, this Finnish woman, kindly informed these guests about the services she was offering on her farm, such as food and the possibility to visit and pet the animals, she got to hear how rude and greedy she was. Rural tourism scholars have also noticed that consumers often expect rural tourism services to be cheap, if not almost free, as ‘tourism is something that people do besides their real jobs’.¹³²⁴ In their edited volume on tourism in peripheral areas, Müller and Jansson¹³²⁵ also draw attention to these kinds of assumptions and challenges. With a clear graphic, tourism researcher Michael Hall¹³²⁶ demonstrates that in rural settings where visitors do not come frequently tourists need to pay a relatively high price for their visit, not the opposite. This might be one dimension that becomes neglected in projects that combine tourism and rural community development.

In San Ramón the latest decline in visits seriously undermined the community’s faith in a brighter future. The people felt that they lacked nearly all support from the middlewomen and tourism intermediaries who could have brought paying visitors to their home communities. The last

1322 Please see also Sammels (2014, 130-34) analysis on the ‘performances of bargaining’ in the highlands of Bolivia.

1323 Best Practises of promoting responsible travel” –workshop in Helsinki, Finland, 25-29 April 2011.

1324 See also George et al. 2009.

1325 Müller & Jansson 2007.

1326 Hall 2007, 25.

time I visited in Nicaragua, in May 2013, I discussed this issue with local coordinators at the office of cooperative union UCA San Ramón. The two coordinators seemed to be aware of the expectations that the local hosts had; however, they considered that they were already doing all they could in order to revitalize the project. They underlined that there were still some groups coming to the area, but that the local hosts lacked the motivation and readiness to receive the guests.

In our brief meeting, the coordinators told me that they had succeeded in creating new contacts with some volunteer tourism organizations in the United States. This was not a surprise as such, taking into account the last years' rapid growth in volunteer tourism.¹³²⁷ Moreover, families in San Ramón had accommodated long-term volunteers, especially from Denmark, somewhat regularly. Hence, UCA San Ramón's website also included the following option:

'Volunteering at UCA San Ramón, (3 months): Three meals per day, lodging, talks about coffee, etc., access to Internet, paper, free use of a bike. Price: US\$ 1050.'

Knowing this, I was surprised and disappointed to hear that the local coordinators had already agreed that a group of volunteers could come and stay with local families *for free*. Young volunteers from an organization called *Amigos de las Américas*¹³²⁸ were expected to arrive to San Ramón for a six-week stay during summer 2013. Instead of paying for their stay, they had promised to run social projects in their host communities and to leave a donation of approximately 400 dollars at the time of their departure. It turned out that also the local coordinators had mixed feelings about the meaningfulness of these visits. Even more, they seemed to be afraid of how their member communities would react to this agreement.

1327 Wearing 2001; Wearing, Deville & Lyons 2008; Vrasti 2013; Mostafanezhad 2013. Jänis & Timonen 2014.

1328 The web-page of the 'Amigos de las Américas' presents that 'AMIGOS' volunteer opportunities focus on youth leadership training and community development in Latin America.'

The coordinators must have been aware that the timing in asking the local hosts to receive visitors for free was not the best possible. A few months earlier the coffee-cultivating communities had been attacked by a severe coffee plant disease called *La Roya*¹³²⁹ and many farmers had lost up to 50-70 per cent of their coffee plants. The scenery in the coffee hills was quite dramatic: the local farmers, just like many farmers around the entire Central America, had to cut away the dead plants and had piled the plants to be used as firewood. It was estimated that it would take from three to four years before coffee production would recover to the level it had been on before this disease. In 2003, the original idea of tourism development had been introduced to San Ramón in order to bring supplementary income and to help communities to survive coffee crises like this.

During my stay in the coffee communities, many farmers and their family members shared with me their concerns about the situation. It was not only that they wondered whether they would be able to send their children to school; the poorest families were also anxious about the possible shortage of food.¹³³⁰ A few weeks after my visit at the office of UCA San Ramón, I met the other coordinator, Keyling, in one of the tourism communities. She came there for a meeting with the local hosts in order to help them to get prepared for a forthcoming one-day visit by a tourist group. The agenda also included a discussion about the arrival of the volunteers of 'Amigos de las Americas'. I was pleased that Keyling and the local hosts invited me to participate in the meeting.

The meeting took place in the new coffee-roasting house, built for the women's cooperative. In addition to the coordinator and myself, there were six women and one man who were together responsible for tourism accommodation in their homes. The women were happy and proud to present the new building for coffee roasting and to tell that many small-coffee shops in the closest town, Matagalpa, were already buying their coffee. In the actual meeting the discussion was led by Keyling, who began by going through the

1329 For more information about *la Roya*, please see Olam 2013; Terazono, E. 2013.

1330 For more on the interconnections between tourism and food security in Nicaragua, see Cañada 2011; Knapman 2011.

plans for the approaching one-day visit. After that the participants shared some concerned words about a young Danish volunteer who had been staying in the community for couple of months. They could not understand why this young man had stopped participating in his only task in the community: roasting coffee with the local women twice a week. After a while, Keyling went on and told about the new groups of volunteers called *Amigos de las Americas*. She told briefly that there were young volunteers coming from the US; more specifically, these guests wanted to stay for six weeks and carry out an unspecified social project during their stay. They were not going to pay for their visit, but would leave a donation for the community.

After that everybody in the meeting remained awkwardly quiet. One stared at the floor, one was looking out the window and the rest were glancing at each other. It was obvious that the people were reluctant to accept even the idea of receiving visitors for free. They had just cooked their lunches using firewood made out of coffee plants! From their point of view, I assume, it must have looked like the coordinator had just encouraged them to forget their various efforts, experiences and expectations as tourism entrepreneurs. At least she had left no room for the local hosts to discuss the compensation they would receive for welcoming these guests. When the uncomfortable silence finally ended, the hosts brought up how expensive and stressful it was to feed, guide and take care of the visitors. It became clear that the guests' presence does affect the family routines, add to their food consumption, make the hosts worry about their guests health and comfort, and so on.¹³³¹ These arguments are in line with Derrida's¹³³² definition of welcoming and hospitality as interruption of self – as putting into question one's freedom. In this particular meeting the local hosts discussed and considered their willingness and readiness to interrupt their freedom by welcoming the young volunteers.

It would be naïve to expect that visitors, even volunteers, would not affect hosts' everyday life. In her research on the idea of sharing a home,

1331 See also Järvinen-Tassopoulos 2010, 314; 323.

1332 Derrida AEL 1999, 51; Levinas T&I 1969, 82.

Järvinen-Tassopoulos¹³³³ brings up the need to acknowledge the ways in which the existing social relation between host and guest paves the way for hospitable encounters. In the case of San Ramón, the visitors were young volunteer workers with an interest in learning from and helping the locals. However, it is possible to imagine that the social relation or a social contract between tourism entrepreneurs and these guests who flouted the need to pay for tourism services must have been rather weak. It can even be so that these particular volunteers were not even perceived as guests, which can also explain the hosts' reluctance to express their hospitality.¹³³⁴

The situation was also awkward inasmuch as the local tourism coordinators had seemingly already promised this volunteer tourism organization that they could send their volunteers to San Ramón. The coordinators had already welcomed the volunteers, meaning that the people working with tourism accommodation were not the ones saying 'welcome'; they were not *the subjects of welcome*. After a decade of tourism development, Keyling, in the role of tourism coordinator, tried to assure the local hosts that receiving volunteers would be better than nothing. But was it really? For whom? This was one of the many situations in which I had to seriously question my rights and responsibilities as a researcher.¹³³⁵ In this case I must admit that I ended up hinting that in my opinion the volunteers *should* pay for their visit as they were actually coming to communities whose residents were professionals in tourism. I was quite irritated by the fact that the hosts who had taken loans to improve the tourists' accommodation were now being asked to accommodate visitors for free. What is more, during this time the visitors' room would be occupied and the families would have to say *no* to other possible guests. If the tourists stayed with the families for six weeks, the costs (according to their official price list) would be approximately 840 dollars, that is, 140 dollars per week for six weeks. According to the special

1333 Järvinen-Tassopoulos 2010, 314-23.

1334 On the hosts' interest for showing hospitality, see Järvinen-Tassopoulos 2010.

1335 This dilemma is wonderfully explored in Caton's doctoral research project (2008) and in her article *Between you and me: Making messes with constructivism and Critical Theory* (2914). Caton discusses about her responsibilities as a researcher and teacher to address injustices and work for a social change.

pricelist for volunteers, the price could be a little bit lower. It might be relevant to mention that each volunteer pays 5,850 dollars¹³³⁶ for his/her experience to the organization *Amigos de las Americas*.

Without questioning the possible positive impacts of such volunteer projects, I want to make clear that this particular meeting at the coffee-roasting house did not include any discussion about the purpose and goals of the 'social project' that the volunteers wanted to carry out. In my later discussion with doña Thelma, a woman from another community who had promised to accommodate volunteers in her home, she said that she did not know anything about the forthcoming social project either. Doña Thelma been active in building a health centre in her community and she was now hoping that the new volunteers would help to build a fence around this centre.¹³³⁷ Otherwise, doña Thelma continued, there were no real social projects that they would have needed help with. Listening to the earlier meeting in the coffee roaster and then the thoughts of doña Thelma, it sounded like the local hosts were receiving young volunteers as kids who needed to have some activities during their vacation. Vradi¹³³⁸ succinctly states that in these kinds of volunteer programs it often remains, 'a mystery what exactly is so problematic about the country that requires the urgent intervention of white vacationing youths'.

Vradi¹³³⁹ also points out that these volunteers are rarely sent to the poorest areas or poorest homes. This corresponds well with the arguments presented in the meeting between in the coffee toasting house. In fact, during the meeting one of the women proposed that the volunteers could actually stay with families who were *not* involved with tourism. In response, her peers considered this impossible as the volunteers needed their own rooms, better toilets and carefully prepared meals. In addition to this, they ended up agreeing that by accommodating these young visitors in the tourists' rooms, the rest of the community could develop a more positive attitude towards tourism. They felt that with volunteers somehow helping the entire

1336 See the website of the Amigos, www.amigoslink.org. Website accessed 6 June 2014.

1337 According to doña Thelma this fence was necessary to keep away potential thieves.

1338 Vradi 2013, 89.

1339 Ibid., 65.

community, the act of accommodating them would make the hosts appear unselfish. To borrowing from the latest business jargon, it seems like these entrepreneurs saw this as a good chance to market their 'corporate social responsibility'. However, their wanting to look like responsible community members and ethical hosts does not vitiate, in my opinion, the dubiousness of the volunteer organization and local coordinators asking the local hosts to put up volunteers.

It must have been convenient for the volunteer organization to send its customers to rural communities that had a great deal of experience in receiving tourists. In these homes visitors even get their rooms cleaned every day. As this study focuses especially on the encounters between tourism experts and rural communities, I have not found it relevant to contact the volunteers who came to San Ramón between June and July 2013. However, if I had had an opportunity to pose few questions to the 'amigos', I would have been curious to hear whether they had acknowledged the extensive efforts that the locals had made to turn their homes and home villages into 'visitable' tourism sites. Or whether had they experienced the communities as a huge 'backstage' where they had gotten an extraordinary chance to experience authentic local life. How had they experienced and interpreted the welcoming signposts, hostel-like rooms and, not least, webpages that inform visitors? Had they noticed that while they were using a flush toilet and taking showers, their hosts went to an outhouse and used water from the buckets? Or perhaps the volunteers felt that they deserved better conditions as they arrived with their project and donation, that is, with their gifts for the hosts.

Taking into account the previous tourism encounters in San Ramón, it looks like many guests had valued the help they offered help as the best gift the local hosts could receive – even better in fact than paying for the tourism services that the hosts were offering. Could it be that these gifts function like 'backstage passes' which separate the tidy guests from tourists? Often these gifts come wrapped, if not in the white woman's or man's burden, at least in pre-assumptions about the local needs. These gifts bring to my mind

Anni-Siiri Länsman's¹³⁴⁰ research on host-guest relations between Finnish tourists and the indigenous Sámi minority in the northernmost part of the Finnish province of Lapland. In her research, Länsman, using the concept of the gift by Marcel Mauss¹³⁴¹, discusses the discourses and traditions relating to a bottle of liquor as a gift. The bottle is here seen as a gift which makes the local hosts more receptive and ready to invite their guests onto their lands. However, as Länsman argues in her research, 'viewed from the theory of the logic of giving¹³⁴², *land* (home) is an object that Sámi cannot give away without losing their identity'. As in Finnish Lapland, in San Ramón the local hosts have different opinions about the symbolic or real meanings of the gifts that their guests bring.

Not only do gifts call for a response from the host, but they also can challenge and question the hosts' right to define their conditions and limits of hospitality. In other words, the hosts can feel obligated to receive the gift, which comes in different forms of projects and studies. Although it is unsure whether the visitors will come with something helpful, or even with something harmful, the rural communities are expected to be receptive towards these guests. If hospitality is about interrupting self and suspending one's ego¹³⁴³, I argue that asking the hosts to say 'yes' unconditionally to strangers and their gifts means demanding that the hosts question their ego. Or, as in the research of Länsman¹³⁴⁴, Finnish guests are asking their hosts to question their identity. Particularly in the case of volunteers, this might mean that the hosts in San Ramón have to question their identity *and* ego as tourism entrepreneurs – and even as adults who are well-off without the help from young volunteers. While Derrida and Levinas define the act of questioning one's ego as a precondition of ethical subjectivity, responsible encounters would require both parties, host and guest, to be ready for this interruption.

After ten years of tourism development in San Ramón the local tourism entrepreneurs still feel that they are not recognized as tourism entrepreneurs.

1340 Länsman, 2004.

1341 Mauss 2008/1924; See also Kuokkanen 2007; Pyyhtinen 2014.

1342 Codelier 1999 in Länsman 2004, 187.

1343 Levinas T&I 1969, 82-4; Derrida AEL 1999, 50-1.

1344 Länsman 2004.

Many of their guests have openly or indirectly pointed out how the hosts are continuously in need of assistance in order to improve their homes or their lives in general. These settings re-construct the hosts as those who are always ‘not there quite yet’. It is this subject position of ‘being a subject which is not quite there yet’, which is interpreted as a need for more experience and practice – and more help from the tidy guests. In a longitudinal study on rural tourism in Turkey, Tucker¹³⁴⁵ uses the analytical concept of *peasant entrepreneurship* which, according to her, is always in the process of becoming.

In my view, we cannot disregard the way in which the idea of an ‘infinite state of becoming’ inevitably disrupts the artificial dichotomy between developing and developed. In other words, it deconstructs the idea of a developed self who could teach the other how to become developed. Acknowledging – and embracing – the unfinishedness of self, questions the fairness and meaningfulness of transferring knowledge only from self to the other, that is, to teach the other. Instead, following Levinas’¹³⁴⁶ line of thought, embracing unfinishedness allows self to make space for the other to enter – to say welcome *to* the other. I will now move on to conclude this analysis chapter.

6.5 Responsibilities of welcoming

Various examples from San Ramón indicate that developing tourism in rural communities might be more complicated than ‘washing your pig and showing your home’.¹³⁴⁷ In this chapter I have moved somewhat chronologically: I began the analysis from the encounters where tourism developers had recommended to the local farmers and families that they should take loans for tourism development, and then moved on towards the time when tourists were no longer coming. When numbers declined – despite the improvements – the hosts were expected, on the one hand, to take more loans and, on the

1345 Tucker 2010.

1346 See Levinas’ (T&I 1969, 51) thought on infinity as ‘welcoming more than I contain’.

1347 This was the comment made by a represent of the Nicaraguan tourism Ministry, INTUR.

other, to receive visitors for free. It seems like during the first years the local hosts appreciated and benefitted more from the help of development officials than they did thereafter: A decade of different kinds of tourism projects had made many local hosts frustrated and reluctant to receive more tourism experts, students – and even researchers. With this development in mind, the chapter sought to discuss the challenges in establishing open dialogue between local hosts and guests who want to help them. Thus, in comparison to Chapter 5, it placed more of an emphasis on the existing and missing face-to-face encounters in rural communities and homes.

In light of the present analysis, I would argue that, despite emancipatory intentions to empower the local hosts, tourism experts tend to dominate the negotiations of hospitality even at the grass-root levels. In San Ramón this happened, for instance, in the encounters where tourism officials ignored or played down the challenges and risks of taking loans, of opening one's home for strangers, or of combining the traditional forms of income with tourism activities. It seems like the meagre material conditions in local homes might be interpreted as an open and unconditional welcome for the active guests to enter, help and develop the locals. While some travellers and volunteers might be attracted by the modest circumstances, developers tend to perceive material scarcity as a limitation on tourism growth. As Vraști¹³⁴⁸ argues, both of these views are privileged ones which re-construct otherness and silence the other; the first romanticizes and the latter patronizes the local hosts. Put things in somewhat different terms, I argue that the lack of material conditions in tourism accommodation maintains the privileged position of the visitor, and limits the possibilities of creating open dialogue between hosts and guests.¹³⁴⁹

When it comes to participatory projects, tourism developers in particular should take seriously the challenge of ensuring discursive spaces for the other.¹³⁵⁰ First, this means acknowledging how the others might be excluded from the spheres where conditions of hospitality are supposed to

1348 Vraști 2013, 70-5.

1349 Höckert 2014, 108-11.

1350 Sharpe & Spivak 2002; Kapoor 2004; Eriksson Baaz 2005; For this argument I have drawn inspiration from Kuokkanen 2007, 114-5.

be negotiated and decided. It means acknowledging the ways in which one – based on one’s relatively more privileged position – might dominate and host these spaces without welcoming the other to engage in open dialogue. We should not trivialize the possibility of this happening. One should not assume, as Spivak’s commentator Kapoor¹³⁵¹ emphasizes, that the other will be participating equally in the dialogue at the moment one wishes to listen.¹³⁵² Second, after acknowledging the impossibility of completely equal participation in the spaces of dialogue, there remains the challenge of resisting the pre-closure of the space, that is, keeping the doors open to the unexpected.¹³⁵³

To conclude the chapter, I suggest that, in the context of participatory tourism development, the spaces for negotiation must allow open and informed discussion about the possible challenges of welcoming tourism and tourists. This requires acknowledging how previous experiences of tourism encounters, or lack thereof, shape the possibilities of making an informed decision. However, as Derrida argues in his book *Negotiations*¹³⁵⁴, even the decision or action based on this calculation includes a risk. Naas¹³⁵⁵ quotes Derrida’s statement ‘Nothing can ever assure us that this negotiation will not go terribly awry, either for the host or for the guest.’ In regard to social projects, we could expect that dialogue, actions and their outcomes would prioritize the well-being of the rural hosts; that is, they would strengthen the subjectivity of the local hosts – subjects as hosts.¹³⁵⁶ If this is the case, development experts in the role of guest have the responsibility to bring up the challenges and possible downsides of rural tourism development, even if it would risk the future of a pre-planned tourism project or the arrival of an already welcomed group of volunteers. While I acknowledge the structural problems in the project-worlds that relate to this, we should challenge

1351 Kapoor 2004.

1352 See Derrida’s discussion on asymmetry of response in 1999, 22-5; see also Levinas EI 1985, 98-9.

1353 Derrida AEL 1999, 26.

1354 Derrida 2002, 31; see also Bonney 2012.

1355 Naas 2008, 26.

1356 Levinas T&I 1969, 84, 299; Raffoul 2002.

the ways in which participation becomes implemented in contemporary participatory projects. I argue that more inclusive forms of participation require a readiness to interrupt self and to question one's ego as an expert and a helper. In the following chapter, I go on to envision what these kinds of more welcoming encounters might look like.

7 ENVISIONING HOSPITABLE ENCOUNTERS

It was during my last field visit in San Ramón that I met one of the local guides, Fernando, at the office of UCA San Ramón. He told me that he was there waiting for a group of representatives from the national tourism network RENITURAL¹³⁵⁷ and from an international tour operator. This group had become interested in tourism development in the area of San Ramón through an international tourism feria called *Fenitur*, which was organized in Managua in April 2013. As a result, the tourism coordinators at the office of UCA San Ramón and the local hosts in Fernando's home community were hoping that these visitors would become interested in sending more tourists to the area. Fernando and the other local hosts were calling this visit a simulacrum, which would allow them to show these 'test visitors' how they welcome travellers to their homes. The representatives were supposed to arrive already at 8:30 in the morning, but now it was already noon. Fernando was still waiting, wearing a nice pair of black trousers and a 'RENITURAL' shirt. He told me about the detailed plans he had made for the visit; however, now he would have to present San Ramón and his home community much faster than planned.

Finally the group arrived. It was already one o'clock and Fernando had almost no time to give the tour before having lunch in doña Jisenia's kitchen. During what was a quick meal the guests did not talk to doña Jisenia, or ask anything about her experiences with tourism development; instead, they spoke only with Fernando. After this they jumped into their minibus and drove away. Later, when I had a chance to discuss the visit with the local hosts, they pointed out that the guests had mainly been interested in checking the quality of local accommodation and food services. Although

1357 RENITURAL = Nicaraguan Network for Rural Community-based Tourism

I knew that working as a guide or with tourism accommodation required flexibility and constant readiness¹³⁵⁸, this simulacrum made me annoyed and upset on behalf of the local families who had expended quite a bit of effort in preparing their homes and themselves for this visit. My frustration was undoubtedly mixed with the worry about the difficulties of bringing in tourists to the area. All in all, it seemed contradictory that people who had been interested in sending visitors to this community had neither respected the plans for the guided tour around the community nor started any kind of conversation with the local hosts.¹³⁵⁹ Moreover, I knew that the local hosts consider the interaction with the families and tranquil walks on the mountains to be the most important part of their tourism product – more important than food, beds or showers.

Although some of the tourism practitioners had focused primarily on curtains and menus, this was not the case with all the tourism experts. For instance, I was once there when a tourism consultant from Lux Development took a long walk with the local guide through the coffee fields and other sights. While the consultant also focused on technical issues, the walk offered an opportunity for a more equal discussion about the concerns and challenges related to tourism development. Instead of dwelling on what were rather disappointing experiences of unequal encounters – or wondering why the Levinasian¹³⁶⁰ idea of infinite openness between hosts and guests does not seem apply in the rural communities – I would like to try to change perspectives. Rather than focusing solely on encounters without hospitality, I will continue with an exercise that challenges me to articulate what hospitable encounters could look like. The instructions for this exercise, which draws inspiration from Christian Lund's¹³⁶¹ lectures at the University of Helsinki in January 2013, are the following:

1358 The importance of these qualities or attributes in tourism as work discussed in Hakkarainen 2009; Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2010; Salazar 2010; Rantala 2011a; Nousiainen 2015.

1359 I acknowledge that my view could have been different if I had had a chance to talk to the visitors.

1360 Levinas T&I 1969.

1361 For Lund's work that we discussed during the course, see Lund (2014) *Of What is This a Case?: Analytical Movements in Qualitative Social Science Research*.

One day when I came home from collecting my empirical data, I thought that ‘today I had seen hospitality as Levinas and Derrida would define it’. So what do I think I had seen? What makes me think I had seen hospitable encounters? What were the things that I observed? And, finally, who did I think had hospitality and how?

Answering these questions could also be called ‘sociological fiction’, where the change is expected to happen not in the future, but in our imaginings at this moment.¹³⁶²

In order to challenge and question some of the understandings of tourism encounters¹³⁶³, this chapter is dedicated to imagining different modes of being and becoming or, put otherwise, to envisioning alternative ways of doing togetherness.¹³⁶⁴ Accordingly, I have given set myself two tasks in this chapter: first, to imagine and describe what an ethical and hospitable space between hosts and guests could look like in San Ramón’s context and, second, to discuss how these spaces could be made more open and equal for everyone to participate in. Tourism scholar Alexander Grit,¹³⁶⁵ drawing especially from the discussions of Deleuze and Guattari, uses the concept of *hospity* to describe the idea of opening up new spaces of hospitality. According to Grit¹³⁶⁶:

This hospity is an experience within spaces of hospitality which is not defined yet; the host guest relationship and interactions are not pre-given. This space can host different becomings with, on the one hand, creative becomings whereby the virtual becomes actual and, on the other, rather planned becomings whereby the possible becomes real through a process of realization.

1362 See also how Veijola & Jokinen 1994 (quoting Game); Veijola 1997, 31; Ronkainen 1999, 14, approach the idea of imagining the change at this very moment; see also Caton 2012, 1907.

1363 Jennings 2005, 180.

1364 see also Germann Molz & Gibson 2007.

1365 Grit 2014.

1366 *Ibid.*, 132.

In Grit's¹³⁶⁷ view, host-guest relationships can quickly alter, meaning that hospitality can be a very temporary space of hospitality. Rather than reinforcing the notion of hospitality as an obligation to prepare people, places and spaces, Grit's call for hospitality prompts an idea of an open and serendipitous encounter between self and others.¹³⁶⁸

Drawing especially on Derrida's and Levinas' discussions on hospitality as 'being-for-the-other', this chapter suggests that opening more hospitable spheres between hosts and guests requires a mutual readiness to interrupt self, that is, to disrupt one's freedom as spontaneous subject. As discussed in the Sections 3.3 and 6.4, the idea of interrupting self, as Levinas and Derrida¹³⁶⁹ highlight, is necessary in order to allow subject positions, such as self-other, subject-object, teacher-student, host-guest, to become more mobile. This chapter focuses on the local hosts' experiences of successful encounters with their guests. The main data used for the analysis are the interviews with the local hosts in the communities of San Ramón. Additionally, the analysis is based on my 'field notes' of my own experiences as a visiting guest in these communities. Doing this exercise made me realize that traces of hospitability are weaker in the encounters between local hosts and tourism experts than they are in other host-guest relations. I do not want to dismiss the ways in which rural community-based tourism development, at large, can be seen as an interruption of more conventional and neoliberal forms of tourism development. However, this chapter emphasizes hospitable spaces in micro-level face-to-face-encounters between hosts and guests.

The first section discusses how hospitality could be understood as an idea of sharing time among ourselves – as a readiness to interrupt one's plans and schedules for the other. Hence, I approach the issue of 'making space for the other' with the notions of *time* and *tranquillity*.¹³⁷⁰ The second

1367 Ibid., 133.

1368 See also Veijola et al. 2014, 3, 11.

1369 Derrida AEL 1999, 51-52.

1370 I have not approached the issue of time from the tourism practitioners' perspective for the reason that the idea of sharing time did not occur in those interviews I conducted with the tourism experts' in Nicaragua. In fact, based on my own observation, many of the development practitioners seemed visit the rural communities as fast as possible – despite the fact that the communities had prepared themselves to accommodate these guests.

section approaches the question of interrupting self from the perspective of being ready to be taught by the other. The Levinasian idea of welcoming teaching reveals how his primary interest in ethical relations lies in neither teaching nor learning, but in the idea of being taught.¹³⁷¹ The primary focus of the analysis is on the meanings that the local hosts have given to the possibilities for learning from one another.¹³⁷² The last part then takes up the importance of recognizing how the conditions of welcoming become negotiated between hosts and guests. The section is based on local hosts' wishes that guests would respect the conditions, such as paying for the tourism services, when visiting the community of San Ramón. The analysis suggests that basing the debates on more responsible forms of travelling on the guests' assumptions of responsibility includes a risk of re-constructing the immobile subject positions between haves and have-nots, those who can afford mobility, and those who do not.¹³⁷³

7.1 Tranquility at home

The exercise in changing the perspective – of imagining what hospitable encounters actually could look like –requires me, peculiarly, to go back in time. As a result, it means putting on the same sunglasses¹³⁷⁴ that I had on when I first visited the communities of San Ramón, when I was inspired for the first time by their slogan 'meet, and get to know, the faces behind the coffee cup'.¹³⁷⁵ Back then in 2008, I was eager to see the great potential of community-based tourism as a unique setting of mutual respect and responsibility between hosts and guests.¹³⁷⁶ I saw that community-based

1371 Derrida AEL 1999, 18; Levinas T&I 1969,180-3; I have previously discussed about un-learning, teaching and being taught in Höckert 2014, 111.

1372 Dredge & Hales 2012. These questions of teaching and being taught correspond with the main questions posed within critical pedagogy.

1373 See, for instance, Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; McEwan 2009, 218-30; See also Ahmed's (2000, 172) thought on the risk of self freezing or relegating others to 'local' spaces.

1374 For the metaphor of sunglasses in tourism research, see Jokinen & Veijola, 1994.

1375 UCA San Ramón <http://www.tourism.ucasanramon.com/> website accessed 6 July 2014.

1376 Höckert 2009.

tourism included an aspiration to care for each other, mixing happily the ideas of communality and multiculturalism.¹³⁷⁷ The visitors would arrive with enthusiasm to help the locals, and the locals would be committed to caring for their guests. However, as I gained more knowledge about these encounters in practice and read more of the scholarly debates on these kinds of encounters, I noticed that the brand of my previous sunglasses was – quite embarrassingly – ‘Naïve’. No doubt, this brand has never been cool or trendy in academic discussions. Moreover, many might consider it even strange that these kinds of sunglasses come in adult sizes. In any event, I still have mine and I am happy to get to wear them on special occasions like this, that is, in a situation where they help me reflect how and why we consider something as responsible or ethical.

Another good reason to put these glasses on is the way they force me to think about the filters that I have used when drawing on the postcolonial approach.¹³⁷⁸ By filters I refer to the special view of the world one gets when travelling – albeit in fiction – with postcolonial writers such as Spivak, Escobar, Mignolo, Pratt or Kincaid. Using these filters comes with a risk of strengthening, instead of deconstructing the existing binaries between self and the subaltern other. That is, the risk in postcolonial analysis is that the outcomes – such as finding instances of epistemic violence and material exploitation based on colonial conditions – are decided even before engaging with the empirical context. For instance, in my study I have conducted fieldwork and analysis with Spivak’s thoughts close by, which has directed my radar towards unethical behaviour among the privileged ones. This makes it difficult *not* to romanticize or victimize the unprivileged ‘other’ – although this is exactly what Spivak and Kincaid tell critical researchers and travellers *not* to do. In order to avoid essentialising postcolonial encounters,

1377 Vrasti (2013) writes how these values often guide volunteers who wish to engage with rural communities in the Global South. For ethics of care, see Jamal & Stronza 2008.

1378 While saying this, my intentions are not to ignore the historical and material contexts where the encounters take place.

tourism scholars Hollinshead¹³⁷⁹, McNaughton¹³⁸⁰, and Tucker¹³⁸¹ have called attention to the ways in which Bhabha's idea of *hybrid subject*¹³⁸², offers an opportunity to resist the totalizing repression of colonialism.¹³⁸³ On the whole, I argue that wearing only postcolonial glasses can make one blind to emerging, alternative ways of caring for the other and the multiple others.

Although my study has focused extensively on guests' desire to help the hosts in San Ramón, it is worth keeping in mind that also the hosts care for their guests. While it is true that the tourism practitioners provided different kinds of training and capacity-building exercises to prepare the hosts to offer their *care* in a context of tourism services, we cannot deny that there are also many other forms of caring than serving food and drink and cleaning one's home. Doña Thelma, who had been accommodating tourists for several years, explained in our interview:

One time this one tourist from US got very sick, which really made the family (who was hosting her) worried. The tourist needed to go to the hospital, but she wanted to go there by herself. The family continued to be worried after she had left alone, so they decided to follow her to Matagalpa (a one-hour bus ride away from this community), and look for her because they wanted to take care of her. The poor girl had appendicitis and the family was saddened that she went through everything alone. (2008/12/ F.)

Other people whom I interviewed and discussed with in the communities of San Ramón also brought up the fact that they often were concerned about their visitors' health, whether their guests found their accommodation comfortable, or whether the guests were walking safely on the mountains. People who work with tourist accommodation emphasized the importance of letting guests know that the hosts were there for them. Thus, while many

1379 Hollinshead 1998, 2004.

1380 McNaughton 2006.

1381 Tucker 2003; see also Tucker (2014, 201) on *fluidity* of subject positions.

1382 Bhabha 1994.

1383 Tucker & Akama 2009, 514.

of their guests arrived in the communities of San Ramón to promote the locals' well-being, the local hosts also considered it important to be able to take care of their guests. Perhaps this kind of mutual longing to take *care* of each other could be interpreted as a sign of hospitableness between hosts and guests.¹³⁸⁴

This resonates with Jokinen and Veijola's discussions in *Reflections on Borderless Care*, in which they propose that tourism and the tourist experience in general, is *all* about the care.¹³⁸⁵ The importance of mutual *caring* in ethical relations also echoes recent theoretical discussions in Mostafanezhad's and Hannam's¹³⁸⁶ anthology *Moral encounters in tourism*. However, some of the writers in the book call attention to the ways in which the recent trend of moralizing tourism has turned the question of care into one of the laudable personal qualities of *the traveller*.¹³⁸⁷ Thus, these discussions focus merely on the guests' desire to be responsible towards the host. It is necessary to ask whether the discourses that search for more ethical forms of tourism assign role of active subject solely to tourists and tourism developers. If so, they create an impression that ethics and respect in tourism encounters would most of all depend on the interests, values and plans of the guests.

During my stays in San Ramón, it became obvious that *time* played a significant role in hospitable encounters. Based on my own experiences, and discussions and interviews with the local hosts, it is fair to say that peacefulness and tranquillity are, in the local hosts' opinion, pivotal aspects of the desired tourism encounters in San Ramón. In fact, 'todo tranquilo' (everything is tranquil) is a common saying which indicates that everything is all right. A good starting point for envisioning hospitable encounters could be to quote doña Hilda. For her hospitality means saying 'Welcome to my home'. She continued that welcoming means hoping that, 'the visitors feel like they are part of the family and that they feel at peace'. The same mes-

1384 For the conceptualization of *care* in local-global spaces, see Jamal & Stronza 2008. See also Jamal & Camargo 2014; Jamal, Budke & Barradas-Briebiesca 2014, 140-80.

1385 Jokinen & Veijola 2012, 40.

1386 Mostafanezhad & Hannam 2014.

1387 Butcher 2014; Smith, P. 2014; see also Vrasti 2013.

sage occurred in many of my interviews: the people accommodating tourists hoped that their visitors could feel calm and at peace. Many highlighted that they wanted their visitors to stay for at least a couple of days. It is obvious that longer visits would mean more income from the visits; however, the longer stays also allowed the local hosts to present their home community and the mountains at a peaceful tempo, without needing to rush.¹³⁸⁸

Although some of the local hosts in San Ramón wished to receive tourists all the time if possible¹³⁸⁹, many pointed out their desire that their home communities would also remain peaceful. One of the guides, Edmundo, argued that bigger flows of tourists:

... could bring positive economic impacts, but this could affect us who have to live our life here, to study and work and do everything at the farm /.. / If more and more visitors come all the time, it will change the life and the culture here in the communities and inside the families too much. It's good that the tourists come, but with a slow rhythm. (2008/8/M.)

It seems as if the positive attitudes towards tourism could be directly related to this *slow rhythm* mentioned by the guide.¹³⁹⁰ This evokes one of the basic topics in tourism literature: how tourism development becomes socially and culturally more sustainable when the growth of tourism is not overwhelming.¹³⁹¹ However, the question of *rhythm* becomes pivotal especially in *rural* tourism development, where tourism activities form a supplementary source of income. In her study of rural tourism development in Finnish Lapland, Maria Hakkarainen¹³⁹² addresses the challenges of synchronizing the rhythm of tourists' arrivals and activities with agricultural life and work. Although it would be convenient if the 'high-seasons' of

1388 See also Länsman 2004.

1389 For an example where the locals expressed their hope to receive tourists constantly, see Cole 2008.

1390 For exploration on *rhythm in tourism*, see Rantala & Valtonen 2014.

1391 See for instance, Wall & Mathieson 2006, 326.

1392 Hakkarainen 2011; forthcoming; See also Höckert et al. 2013, 166.

tourism took place when there is less work in the fields or farms, it is often precisely that which forms an important part of the tourists' experience. This is also the case in San Ramón, where guests were more interested in coming between October and January so that they would have a chance to participate in the processes of coffee production. However, as the number of tourists had always been relatively low, the local hosts did not seem to experience this as a serious challenge.

In relation to the question of hospitality, many of my interviewees highlighted that while there were guests in their home or home community, they dedicated their time to them. Although many of the local hosts no longer prioritized the different kinds of capacity-building meetings, the tourists' visits were prioritized over everything else. Many used precisely the expression 'to dedicate our time' to describe their commitment towards the travellers. Doña Hilda, told me about such a visit:

A little while ago there was a young traveler who came to visit us. She asked whether we would have time to listen if she played guitar and sang a few songs. And yes, we did have time for her. So we sat there listening. And later on she left with tranquility. This is something that we do with our visitors. (2013/42/F)

In San Ramón the words *tranquility* and *happy faces* were vividly present in stories where the hosts described their experiences of successful encounters. Or, to put it differently, perhaps the calmness of the encounters allows the hosts to enjoy these happy faces. A young woman working with tourism, Claudia, explained that in her opinion hospitality is:

To smile and show your happiness of meeting a person that you do not know (*no conoces*). And you give this person your best. And they look at you with happiness on their face. This is what I think is hospitality. It is the happiness of seeing that these people, the new faces, come to visit us. It is about being kind and about making people feel like this is their home. (2013/44/F)

I can confirm that throughout my participatory observation as an ethnographic researcher I have noticed that this often seems to be the case. In fact, I am thankful for having had the chance to experience this kind of welcoming happiness on some peoples' faces. For me, Claudia's description of hospitality includes a glimpse of Levinas' notion of embodiment of ethics and peace in the (here, smiling) *face* of the other. Levinas¹³⁹³ describes this situation as the 'welcome of the face'. These are encounters where the happiness of engaging in a face-to-face conversation with the other disrupts the closed monologue of the self.¹³⁹⁴ It is the face-to-face encounter which becomes prioritized over other tasks and duties.

The face ethically fulfils and embodies the whole purpose of Levinas' philosophy, especially his aims in *Totality and Infinity*.¹³⁹⁵ For Levinas, the face-to-face encounter is a primordial production of being which helps in tracing the absolute experience of unconditional hospitality, that is, to pursue an absolute ethical experience that is not a disclosure.¹³⁹⁶ The face resists possession or utilization, and invites and obliges one to take on a responsibility that transcends knowledge. However, Levinas¹³⁹⁷ explains, somewhat paradoxically, that goodness, 'concerns a being which is revealed in a face, but thus it does not have eternity without commencement'. He continues that 'peace must be my peace, in a relation that starts from an *I* and goes to the other, in desire and goodness, where the 'self' both maintains itself and exists without egoism'.¹³⁹⁸ For me, it is precisely our egos which enjoy comparing difference and otherness to self – to 'same'.¹³⁹⁹ Hence, for Levinas, the face emerges as an emblem of everything that fundamentally resists categorization, containment or comprehension.¹⁴⁰⁰

With this in mind, it is interesting to take a look at the slogans used for marketing tourism in San Ramón. There are, for instance, different versions

1393 Levinas T&I 1969, 197.

1394 See also Hand 2010, 40.

1395 Ibid., 42; For 'face as a trace', see Derrida AEL 1999, 53.

1396 Levinas 1969, 67.

1397 Ibid., 305.

1398 Ibid., 306.

1399 I have discussed the question of ego previously in Höckert 2014.

1400 Hand 2010, 42.

which encourage the visitors to *meet* the faces and to get to *know* the faces. UCA San Ramón's website invites the visitors to 'Get to *know* the faces, voices and culture of the people behind your cup of fair trade coffee in San Ramón, Matagalpa, Nicaragua'.¹⁴⁰¹ From a Levinasian¹⁴⁰² point of view, it is quite problematic to utilize faces for tourism marketing; it is incongruous to freeze faces on posters and web-pages, as the face is the sign of ultimate openness and welcoming towards the other. As discussed throughout the study, there is a fundamental difference between *knowing* and to *meeting* the other. For the philosophers of ethical subjectivity, the other is not a knowable unit.¹⁴⁰³ When testing this thought, at least I personally feel strong reluctance towards being reduced to something that can be known, categorized and 'said'.¹⁴⁰⁴

It is easy to recognize the desire to know the other, in order to be able to help the other. However, paradoxically the eagerness to know and define the other is often stronger in short-term encounters. In contrast, when meeting the other tranquilly, it becomes less meaningful to categorize and 'to know' the other. The fact that caring and listening requires time has been underlined especially by those scholars who have critiqued participatory development methods such as 'rapid rural appraisal' as rather imperialist ways of collecting information about the other.¹⁴⁰⁵ This methodology, elaborated especially by development experts, includes guidance for studying and understanding the local context in a speedy manner. In other words, by using this approach, a guest-expert can acquire a good overall picture of life in a rural village in a short period of time¹⁴⁰⁶, that is, understand and evaluate the wishes and desires of the people by going or running around with a recorder, notebook and a pen. A somewhat similar kind of efficiency is also celebrated in tourist hype promising that a true cosmopolitan traveller can absorb the essence of an entire country or a continent during a few weeks' vacation. For instance,

1401 Website accessed in 12th of June 2014, www.tourism.ucasanramon.com

1402 Levinas T&I 1969, 194-7, 305; Derrida AEL 1999, 21.

1403 Ibid. Levinas T&I 1969, 84.

1404 See Levinas 1969. Thus, it is also questionable whether the locals themselves would write a slogan "Come to visit me so that you get to know me". For me it does not sound a very common phrase that people say to their guests.

1405 Chambers 1983.

1406 Kapoor 2004.

The Lonely Planet travel books offer great solutions allowing busy travellers to ‘discover’ a ‘hidden’ pearl, for instance Nicaragua, in 14 days. There are also speedy travellers who measure their success in – like Phileas Fogg (Jules Verne 1873) – in the distance covered during an adventure.¹⁴⁰⁷ This idea of travelling has been recently challenged by the idea of *Slow Travel*.¹⁴⁰⁸

The point I want to make here is that the fast visits and appraisals can make it difficult to find, recognize or promote hospitality.¹⁴⁰⁹ Similarly, when we encounter each other in a rush, there might be a smaller chance for mutual openness. The appreciation of slower life and tranquility, or even more the fear of the things that we might miss in the middle of ‘multitasking’, is something that has become a growing trend in the Western world during the past years. There seems to exist a mass awakening of living mindfully in the present. While the commodified ideas of mindfulness might paint a picture of a new trend, the search for consciousness, just like the search for hospitality, is by no means anything new.¹⁴¹⁰ In fact, following the reflections by Levinas, I perceive these two as being inseparably intertwined.¹⁴¹¹

What bothers me here is not only the tendency of describing mindfulness as a new idea, but also the way in which it has been commercialized to promote the well-being of a busy individual, not well-being between ourselves. These discourses strengthen the individualistic idea that taking care of oneself means closing out the multiple others who might be constantly interrupting us from *ourselves*. In this sense, being-well would mean focusing on one’s own way of being and controlling the interruptions in one’s own time. What is drastically different between the contemporary discussions of mindfulness celebrated by many ‘life-coaches’ and self-help books, on the one hand, and the Levinasian thought of hospitality, on the other, is how the Levinasian¹⁴¹²

1407 See also Pratt, 1992; Vradi 2013, 67–69.

1408 For sustainability and slow travel, see for instance Caffyn 2013; Tiller 2014.

1409 This should not come as a surprise, as many things in general are more difficult to catch or grasp, when the observer or the object is moving very fast.

1410 See for instance, Buddhism.

1411 Derrida (AEL 1999, 46), inspired by Levinas, describes metaphysics as an experience of hospitality – of peace and infinity.

1412 Ibid. 92; Levinas 1969, 172. In this case the Other is written with a capital letter as it refers to the absolute Other.

idea of transcendence reaches out towards the absolutely Other. It means that the beginning of ethical – of ethics as hospitality – is to welcome the other to one’s space and to one’s time.¹⁴¹³ Likewise, consciousness for Levinas¹⁴¹⁴ is not first and foremost the practice of representing existence to ourselves, but a moral event that recognizes and welcomes the inexhaustible other. Consequently consciousness, according to Levinas¹⁴¹⁵, is inherently social and plural – rather than a mode of being which is isolated and sacred. Thus, instead of only finding harmony within oneself, Levinas’ idea of infinity means being ‘beyond being’ – beyond the ontology of isolated subjectivity.¹⁴¹⁶

Putting differently the Levinasian idea of the face, I propose that encountering and spending time with ‘faces’ *do* make us less eager to place that other into neatly limited categories, such as, annoying, naïve, selfish, rich, poor, and so on. Or when we do so, it does not feel right. As a result, if the moment of meeting the other is the beginning of the ethics as hospitality, then a vision of a hospitable encounter could be focused more on sharing time with the other than on knowing that other. In summary, the call for tranquility in face-to-face encounters includes allowing the mountains and coffee tables to mediate hospitality.¹⁴¹⁷ Unlike capacity-building exercises, these encounters are based on the idea of reciprocity and mutual exchange. Adopting a well-known saying, I wish to propose that ‘just like democracy, hospitality, too, begins from the breakfast table’. When allowing the coffee cup to mediate the tranquil encounters with the other, it becomes less relevant to judge, teach and guide the other. Instead, it helps creating an open space for a mutual sense of caring and responsibility and a desire to engage in storytelling with the other. This means taking off the ‘Naïve’ sunglasses – but still continuing to speak the language of goodness, friendship and hospitality.¹⁴¹⁸

1413 Levinas T&O 1987.

1414 Levinas T&I 1969; See also Hand 2010, 38.

1415 Levinas 1969 quoted in Hand 2010, 41; for previous discussions of this idea in the context of tourism, please see Ankor & Wearing 2012; Grimwood & Doubleday 2013.

1416 Levinas, 1969, 305.

1417 For research on the ways in which landscapes mediate the welcome, see Huijbens and Benediktsson 2013.

1418 Ibid.

7.2 Continuum in teaching and learning

Many of the interlocutors in San Ramón gave exceedingly positive meanings to those encounters that took place during the international solidarity movement, in the 1980s.¹⁴¹⁹ At that time, as people described it, visitors were received ‘as friends, not as tourists’. I would submit that one of the main reasons for these positive experiences must have been the fact that the guests stayed for a longer time, with no hurry to leave. Neither did they cause an economic burden to their hosts, as they brought food with them. In those days, there were no third parties involved and the ‘rulebooks’ for the visits were somewhat unwritten. Coupled with the interest to learn from each other, the guests seemed to have few requirements and expectations of their hosts.

During my stays in San Ramón, I also heard stories about guests who had been there in the 1980s and then returned many years later. One was told by doña Hilda:

I remember this very beautiful experience. In the end of their visit we roasted a pig and celebrated and it was a beautiful experience. And when they left, and as it was the first time we worked with them, all the families were very sad. (..) And this person who was the guide for this group said that we have to learn that the groups come and go and come and go. And that we had to learn to attend to them. And I have had opportunities to meet the visitors again (pride). For instance, there was this one visitor who had been staying here with me around year 1985. Then all of a sudden one of the local guides said that there would be a group coming. But I did not know that this group had people who had been here before. And she came and said ‘here I come again’. (..) They always remember us. (2013/42/F.)

1419 See also McRoberts 2012.

While such stories about the first guests were filled with tears of happiness and feelings of appreciation, it is quite interesting to reflect on the leap from those visits to more official tourism encounters. This is particularly so because the positive experiences from the previous encounters had encouraged families to commit themselves to the more official forms of welcoming tourists.

Perhaps the following quotation from Gabriela, a local tourist guide, can disclose the differences between the 1980s and now. In our discussions of hospitality and tourism she distinguished the ideas of being hospitable from material conditions and from offering a tourism service.

I would not like to define hospitality as a concept which refers to service. I want hospitality to be a concept of humanity – to be a human. And tourism is how to sell services and quality. (2013/41/F.)

I would be happy to follow this way of approaching tourism. The approach means that tourism as such is not automatically about hospitality, but rather ethical encounters in tourism settings require hospitality between people. This approach denies the possibility of treating the responsibility of welcoming as a responsibility of the host. Instead, it calls for open welcoming and hospitality from both hosts and guests. This thought is in the same vein as Levinasian¹⁴²⁰ philosophy, which suggests that the *hôte* as host is actually also a guest, meaning that in ethical encounters hospitality and openness cannot be expected only from hosts. However, while the purpose of the later tourism development projects, in most cases, has been to enhance local entrepreneurs' readiness to work with tourism and tourists, this kind of mutual openness has been somewhat missing from the encounters between tourism practitioners and local hosts. This is obviously a strong and provocative argument to make.

I should point out here that in my interactions and interviews with the local hosts, many people talked warmly about a woman called Heather, whose help they greatly appreciated during the first years of tourism develop-

1420 Derrida AEL 1999, 41.

ment. Heather worked, if I have understood correctly, for a North American NGO, and she had been coordinating tourism development at the UCA San Ramón for a couple of years.¹⁴²¹ People also told me about Juan-Miguel, who in their opinion, like Heather, had also been a great coordinator and nice person to work with. In the local hosts' view, both Heather and Juan-Miguel had always stayed in close communication with the members of the tourism communities, and especially with the local guides. The expression that was repeated in people's accounts was *open communication*: in the local hosts' eyes, the coordinators had kept the communication and all actions as transparent and democratic as possible. Most importantly, people committed to tourism development had felt that these coordinators listened to them and took their concerns seriously. Unfortunately, neither Heather nor Juan Miguel get a bigger role in my study, as Heather left Ramón long before I got there. I did have a chance to meet Juan Miguel, but he left his job as coordinator before I could interview him. All in all, it was obvious that the local hosts were disappointed with the new coordinators, who had nearly stopped having face-to-face contact with the people from the four member communities.

In connection to the idea of open communication, one of the reoccurring themes in the descriptions of positive encounters in the 1980s and then twenty years later was the aspect of sharing experiences and knowledge. In fact, the guide Fernando suggested that through tourism development the local hosts had learned to become better listeners and improved their understandings of other cultures. In our interview in 2013, he explained how the experiences with tourists had taught the host families to eat together and use the time to discuss with each other in peace and quiet, which was, according to Fernando, different from the times before tourism development. In his opinion, there were also many things that their guests learned and experienced during their visits in San Ramón, such as 'to eat typical food, speak Spanish, work on the fields, take care of nature and to wake up early'. Fernando continued: 'a happy visitor, who learns from us, is like

1421 For importance of tourism coordinators and mediators see Zorn's & Farthing's (2007) longitudinal research on 'Hosts and Mediators in Peru'.

having a five-star hotel' (2013/45/M). Similarly to Fernando, many hosts explained that sharing ideas and ways of doing things formed part of a successful encounter with their guests. These encounters with tourists, different from the encounters with many of the tourism experts, had allowed more mobility between the acts of teaching and being taught.¹⁴²²

Envisioning more ethical encounters in the context of participatory tourism development could mean moving from limitations of participation towards more mobile roles between teachers and learners. The approach where the other is presented mainly through his or her limitations is a limited one; consequently, I do not find it meaningful to list or define any skills or material conditions as requirements for saying *welcome* to the other. The discussions between Levinas and Derrida confirm that the ethics of hospitality never depend on these kinds of conditions.¹⁴²³ Instead, welcoming and hospitality can be found nearly where- and whenever. Or even more, as I have aimed to emphasize here, we all can give our contribution so that open welcoming could flourish in as many settings as possible. The hospitality that Levinas and Derrida encourage us to envision does neither rests on certifications, or stars that a hotel or an eco-lodge have acquired, or on the coffee cups or silverware on the table.

The material requirements for receiving guests are socially constructed and constantly negotiated, and therefore always due to change. When hospitality becomes commercialized, measured and certified, it also becomes a target of critique and appreciation.¹⁴²⁴ Extreme examples from San Ramón had been those cases where tourism experts or tourists had not been able to appreciate the mountains – which are no doubt the source of local storytelling and pride – because a window was lacking a pair of proper curtains or there were no menus on the table. This means, as Spivak¹⁴²⁵ could explain it that in order for the subaltern other to speak (in this case to be able to show the mountains), she must first adjust herself to the expectations of her guests

1422 Höckert 2014; see also Freire 1970/2000; McRoberts 2012.

1423 Derrida AEL 1999, 2005; For unconditionality of responsibility, see Grimwood & Doubleday 2013a.

1424 Chalip & Costa 2010; See also Tosun (2000) on limits of participation.

1425 Spivak 1988, 281-4.

(in this case to purchase curtains for the tourists' cabins). The use of quality indicators, which are made by the guests, makes it impossible to spot or to find somehow equal encounters between the development practitioners and the locals.

While it is unethical to romanticize or trivialize the material needs of those who are being helped through development projects, it is equally dubious to continuously encounter the farmers and entrepreneurs as people who are 'not quite there yet'. The work of Tucker¹⁴²⁶ on rural tourism entrepreneurs in Turkey is a great illustration of this condition. Tucker suggests that rather than struggling to change the status of a 'not quite yet' subject to a 'ready' one, the struggle could be re-directed towards acknowledging how actually none of us are 'quite yet there neither'. In fact, not even the tidy guests who arrive with the emancipatory intentions to help the rural other. In other words, the acceptance of how we all are in an eternal state of becoming could be faced with celebration instead of grief. Without sinking to radical cultural relativism where everything goes, this thought of continuum in teaching and learning is needed, first of all, to question the chronological idea of progress and the 'stages of growth', which still dominate much of the predominant discourses of development.¹⁴²⁷ To put it differently, the idea of reciprocity in learning disrupts the colonial mind-set which protects the subjects of the West.¹⁴²⁸

Even though the local hosts in San Ramón appreciated the different kinds of trainings in the early years of tourism development, they did not feel comfortable staying on the phase of 'not quite yet'. Just like most of the tourism development experts might see their encounters with these rural communities as a possibility to teach the 'other', the local hosts are also interested in teaching their guests. As an illustration, I go back to my

1426 Tucker 2010; see also Chalip and Costa 2010.

1427 Rostow's 'stages of growth' was the predominant theory of economic development after the Second World War.; For more on this development theory, see Todaro and Smith 2006; Telfer 2009, 2015. See also Teivainens' (2004) writings about the reversal in learning. Most recently Teivainen has addressed the context of global economic crises, where the 'West' has failed to learn from the previous crises, for instance, in Latin America.

1428 See also Kuokkanen 2007, 113-22.

interview with doña Hilda in 2013, when she told about a visit of two women from another tourism community. She was seemingly delighted and proud, when she spoke about the topic:

A little while ago, they came from Jinotega. They will start to work with community-based tourism over there. But there they do not have mountains but just an island. There they are selling their products and food and they have been trained by UNDP. So they came here and said that we have been working with tourism for long time. They came and stayed with me in order to learn about tourism. (2013/42/F.)

Doña Hilda had told them about the visitors in the 1980s, and how the idea for tourism development had occurred after the difficult coffee crises around 2001. She highlighted that she had wanted to be honest to these women. She continued:

In the beginning we felt that this was something very difficult, because we had to go to the capacity building meetings and to be away from home a lot. But this is how we begun with tourism. So we shared all this with the women from Jinotega. And they asked me, “But how are the visitors? As you have received visitors from all kinds of places, how are they?”. So I told them that we have had very nice experiences, but also some less pleasant ones. (2013/42/F.)

Doña Hilda described to me that she and the women from Jinotega had stayed up late by the kitchen table and shared different experiences and expectations that they had about tourism. It seemed to me like the meeting had likewise been important for doña Hilda. Unlike in many previous encounters with tourism experts, these guests had recognized the experiences and knowledge which doña Hilda had as a tourism entrepreneur.¹⁴²⁹

1429 See Valtonen's (2010) research on small firms as agents of critical knowledge. See also Dahles and Lou (2002) on tourism entrepreneurship in Latin America.

The visit had given her, I argue, a chance to change her role from learner to teacher. Or to put it better: while she had received and welcomed the guests, the guests had also welcomed her.

Also other face-to-face encounters around San Ramonian coffee tables indicated the ways in which a fair and equal discussion requires both teaching and learning. Indeed, there is much that we might miss, if we are focused merely on being ready to teach and guide the 'other'; that is, there are things that we might overlook when we are focused on being more ready, and more capable, than others. Levinasian¹⁴³⁰ radical intersubjectivist perspective reveals how we become ready to welcome life and the others, ironically, at the very moment when we give up on the ambition of readiness. In practice, this means shifting from the protection of the ego towards cherishing the unfinished and messy. Hence, ethical subjectivity, consciousness and well-being could be, as Levinas forms it, a desire towards infinity.¹⁴³¹

In contrast to silencing the other, Levinas¹⁴³² celebrates the revelation of the Other that takes place in conversation and teaching. Although Levinas talks about teaching, his prime interest does not lie in either teaching or learning, but in *being taught*. For him welcoming teaching means *receiving more than I contain*. Therefore, welcoming teaching refers to openness and infinity – to a soul capable of containing more than it can draw from itself, to a soul that does not take its own interiority for the totality of being. That is, welcoming teaching is receiving from the other beyond the capacity of 'the I', which means precisely to have the idea of infinity.¹⁴³³ This requires, most of all, a readiness to question one's learned position to guide the other. For me Spivak's call for *unlearning* and Levinas' approach of *receiving more than I contain* sound, when put together, like a continuum of mutual learning and teaching.¹⁴³⁴ In the context of rural tourism, it means rejecting the assumption that teaching is directed only towards 'host' communities; that is, that the flow of teaching would have only one significant direction. Saying this,

1430 Levinas 1969, 180; See also Strhan 2012.

1431 Levinas T&I 1969; Höckert 2014; see also Veijola et al. 2014.

1432 Hand 2010, 40.

1433 Levinas T&I 1969, 51, 180; Derrida AEL 18-27.

1434 See also Kuokkanen 2007, 128-42.

it would be fruitful to trace especially the importance of critical pedagogy and Freire's¹⁴³⁵ thought in the participatory paradigm.

The idea of mutual learning includes the possibility to disrupt the legacy of 'paternalism' in rural tourism encounters – the wish to teach the 'other'. The desire to be taught by 'the subject of the welcome' would mean questioning my will to teach, develop, modernize, thematize, speak, theorize, define, correct, enlighten, and so on.¹⁴³⁶ Following Germann Molz's¹⁴³⁷ work on Freire's notion of *unfinishedness*, it would be necessary to think how to build unfinished design into different kinds of development projects. German Molz¹⁴³⁸ suggests that we often mistake fullness and readiness as preconditions of sociability in tourism, when in fact it is unfinishedness and incompleteness that make new moves possible in the first place. In the field sites of development assistance, this approach would, paradoxically, mean that it is the *failure* in planning, teaching, theorizing, developing, modernizing, colonizing, speaking and defining that could be interpreted as *success*.¹⁴³⁹ In a way, success can be a failure to force someone to buy new curtains or giving up on intentions of knowing, defining and totalizing the other. Or as Spivak¹⁴⁴⁰ puts it, we should try to think about working without guarantees and about seeing one's failure as a success. The approach likewise resonates with Derrida's¹⁴⁴¹ thought on being '...unprepared or prepared to be unprepared, for the unexpected...'

7.3 Learning anew the welcome of the other

Although the purpose of this study has been to focus on the encounters between tourism experts as guests and local communities as hosts, in practice the subject categories of guests and hosts – or experts and locals – are tangled

1435 Freire 1970/2000; McRoberts 2012; see also Germann Molz 2014; Höckert 2014, 115.

1436 See Höckert 2014, 115.

1437 Germann Molz 2014, 31-2.

1438 Ibid.

1439 Höckert 2014, 115; See also Kapoor's (2004, 641-62) call for 'Hyper Self-Reflexive Development?'

1440 Spivak, 2001, 15; see also Kapoor 2004, 644.

1441 Derrida 1999, quoted in Kearney & Dooley 1999, 70.

and messy. In fact, it would be paradoxical and epistemologically violent to try to maintain these categories.¹⁴⁴² One of the many situations where this mobility of expertise became clear took place in doña Hilda's home in 2013. Doña Hilda's son, Jason and I were sitting in the hammocks out on the patio and drinking coffee. I had met Jason for the first time already in 2008, and ever since stayed many times with his family. When the guides were busy, and I had no interviews to make, Jason used to take the role of the host, inviting me to join him on the football field and the coffee fields.

I appreciated the fact that we had had many of these kinds of discussions like we were having now on the patio. This time, we were talking, most of all, about the current situation with the coffee disease *la Roya*. Jason told me that he had had to put his university studies on hold, because the income from the coffee was not enough to pay for his education. He was interested to hear how it was going with my study – and pointed out that it had taken awfully long time for me to finish this study. I responded that my family back home thought the same. However, I also wanted to tell him that in the course of this longitudinal study, I had become fascinated about different ideas of hospitality and different ways of welcoming guests. As a reaction to that he explained that, in his opinion, there were three different kinds of tourists. He described his categorization of tourists, and although my purpose was not to conduct an interview in this situation, I asked whether I could record his interesting 'typology'.¹⁴⁴³ It was fine with him, and with a big smile on his face he repeated:

Firstly, there are tourists who want to go to comfortable places to have fun. Secondly, there are tourists who are interested in conviviality, learning, teaching, sharing and having a close relation with the locals. Thirdly, there are something that we call 'mochilleros' (backpackers). They are interested in getting to know different places with less money. They like to get to know places, but simply without paying. (2013/39/M.)

1442 See also Kuokkanen 2007, 138-42.

1443 For alternative typologies of tourists, see Cole 2008, 166.

Based on our discussion that followed, it was clear that the local hosts in San Ramón perceived the tourists from the second category as their ideal group of guests. However, Jason continued, there had also been many visitors who had chosen, for varying reasons, to ignore the price list for tourism services. According to Jason:

Here people come normally to learn, to get to know the place, and to meet us. But sometimes, all of a sudden, there are also these back-backers who come here. They have heard about the place and they come without knowing that there are rules. That we have rules here. For instance, that you have to pay an entrance fee. But they enter, take their pictures, walk around without paying for a guided tour or anything. (2013/39/M.)

The *Lonely Planet* travel books have succeeded well in helping the back-backers to ‘live and travel on a shoestring’. In fact, a clear sign of a real globetrotter is to have a story or two about exploring exotic places with a minimum budget. I must admit, although I did not admit this to Jason, how I had also been previously bragging about the cost-efficiency of my own trips. However, this is not a phenomenon that only back-baggers could be greeted, or more correctly blamed, for. The chase for cheap last-minute flights, hotels, wine excursions, or yoga retreats rarely include deeper consideration on *why* a last-minute charter trip to Mallorca can actually be so cheap.¹⁴⁴⁴

Jason’s typology reminded me especially of a travel story which a certain tourism researcher once, very proudly, told me and his other colleagues in a Nordic tourism conference. In his story the protagonist, the tourism researcher himself in a role of a traveller, had travelled through the entire Central America by using only one dollar per day. This had allowed him to test and experience the real local life with a budget equivalent to extreme poverty line.¹⁴⁴⁵ The thrilling adventure had been possible, because of, what

1444 For discussions on labor rights, dislocation and economic inequities within the hotel industry – in Mallorca and beyond – see Bianci 2014; Dielemans 2008; Buades 2009; Buades et al. 2012; Bianchi 2014; Schyst Resande 2015.

1445 Perhaps this took place before the extreme poverty line was raised to 1.25 dollars.

many like to call, the local hospitality. He had hitch-hiked, stayed with local families for free, enjoyed their meals and celebrated their holidays. The story included no information about possible compensation for this hospitality. Although he in his own research acknowledges the importance of tourism revenues for small tourism enterprises in the European context, this aspect was peculiarly missing from the story that took place far away from home. He seemed to neglect the fact that in Central America there are thousands and thousands of tourism services which have been developed for foreign visitors like him.¹⁴⁴⁶ And what is more, some of these services have been developed in a way which can help the others *not* having to continue to experience their everyday lives under the poverty line: and one day even have a possibility to choose their own ways of travelling.

Salazar¹⁴⁴⁷ writes ‘the global space is often thought of as the ‘flow’ of people, objects and ideas across national borders and geographic regions’. However, Salazar continues, this trendy imagery of flows is badly chosen if we wish to describe how people, objects and ideas move around the world.¹⁴⁴⁸ That is, going back to San Ramón, the image of cosmopolitan travellers neutrally flowing through rural communities trivializes economic privileges, political implications and the history of previous encounters.¹⁴⁴⁹ In my opinion, Fernando, one of the local guides in San Ramón, puts it quite well:

Tourists come here because they get bored at staying at their own places. The same happens here: the farmers also get tired of their own place and want to get to know other places, but they cannot do that: they do not have money. (2013/45/M.)

The distortion of cosmopolitanism masters the other to allow the flow to keep flowing – at least to one direction.¹⁴⁵⁰ To put it differently, it is hoped that the other participates in encounters that permit free mobility

1446 See for instance, Lonely Planet Nicaragua, Trip Advisor.

1447 Salazar 2010, 8.

1448 For more on thresholds, see Germann Molz & Gibson 2007.

1449 This argument follows Salazar’s discussion on cosmopolitan mobilities.

1450 See also Tsing 2000, 338 in Salazar 2010, 8.

without clashes, misfires, confusion or unnecessary entrance fees. No doubt the encounters between the hosts and guests could be seen as fluxes that the visitor, depending on their travel purposes, might choose to 'have'. And when they do, the locals are expected to engage in these encounters with open homes and open hearts.

Instead of denying the existence of open doors around the world, I have serious doubts that this would be a special quality of the people living in the rural areas in the Global South.¹⁴⁵¹ However, an over myopic view on the local, neglects the fact how a wider scale of global inequalities in wealth, power and mobility limits the possibilities of many of these rural communities to *not* to open their homes. The idea of flowing movement of cosmopolitan travellers becomes interesting at the very moment when these flows are imagined on our own backyards. In fact, the members of the campaign 'not in my backyard' obviously have already dedicated much thought to this, as did the people living in the touristic quarters in Barcelona, who in 2014 organized protests to express their irritation towards the ever growing flows of bad behaving tourists.

Hence, I wonder whether engaging in hospitable, face-to-face encounters with the other could be first practised in one's own homes before widely demanding it from the others. While I acknowledge the difficulty of this, I suggest that we can find the welcoming, smiling faces from our everyday encounters. Most of all, this practise might reveal the awkwardness of searching and longing for conviviality, open hospitality and authentic smiles only when leaving home and travelling abroad.¹⁴⁵²

While some of the tourism destinations might suit the idea of 'flow' of visitors, there are increasing amount of those which do not.¹⁴⁵³ Although a Nicaraguan tourism consultant expressed in our interview that community-based tourism in rural areas has great potentials as, 'people are not suspicious towards visitors but receive them happily' (2012/23/M), the unconditional welcome of the guests cannot be taken for granted. I see that the imaginaries and narratives of always welcoming rural communities is what Spivak calls

1451 For romantic representations of rurality, see Lüthje 2005.

1452 See also Kippendorf 1987; Gmelch 2003; Caton & Santos 2009, 2000.

1453 Ibid.; Dielemans 2008.

as ‘epistemic violence’, which denies the voices that resist or set limits for welcoming. This violence trivializes the questions, such as ‘Why did you come here?’, as Julia Svanberg¹⁴⁵⁴ wonders in her book on tourism encounters in the impoverished communities in the Colombian countryside. In Svanberg’s book, this is what a young Colombian woman asks from tourists who arrive to her home community that she herself desperately tries to escape from. Hence, especially the encounters where the ‘local attractions’ are based on economic marginalization and expected immobility in time and space, it is contradictory to promise hospitality on the behalf of someone else.

The local hosts in rural communities, in my opinion, often are expected to be unconditionally hospitable and social, as rural people always are, amongst themselves and towards their guests. Interestingly, and conveniently, as rural communities are always open and welcoming, the travellers are offered an opportunity to try and celebrate the lost forms of human warmth during their holidays. That is, while the travellers are open minded and happy during their holidays, the local hosts are expected to wear an eternal smile.¹⁴⁵⁵ A web-page which has previously offered educational trips from North America to Nicaragua explained this as follows:

NSS wants to model a different kind of development in Nicaragua that conserves traditional relationship between people and their land and neighbours as the primary relationship that defines the culture. That, in great measure, is what the developed world has lost, but what countries like Nicaragua still have. For that reason, Nicaragua is a valuable reference for our fading memory of what life used to be before the beginning of the age of mass marketing and alienating consumerism.¹⁴⁵⁶

Although this description was written already back in 2000, Vrasti’s recent research on volunteer tourism suggests how today’s discussions on

1454 Svanberg 2014.

1455 This is discussed thoroughly in Gmelch’s (2003) book *Behind the Smile*.

1456 Paul Martin in 2000, A New Revolution in Nicaragua: Edu-Tourism! www.planeta.com website accessed 4 March, 2014.

ethical tourism reflect similar kinds of attitudes about the travel destinations' in the 'Third World'.¹⁴⁵⁷ These discourses of responsible travelling tend to neglect or romanticize the inequalities in material progress, and also social immobility of many of the people living in rural communities.¹⁴⁵⁸ This narrative co-construct colonial imaginings where the authentic 'other' is there for the self to be discovered;¹⁴⁵⁹ what is more, this kind of romantification of 'traditional ways of life' contributes to a mind-set in which it is seen almost damaging to 'give money to the locals'.¹⁴⁶⁰ As the travellers who, 'look around at their own country and bemoan the problems that false prosperity has brought to them' (as expressed on the same web-site)¹⁴⁶¹, might become convinced that the local communities in the 'developing world' are better off without this harmful prosperity. As an outcome, it is again the guests who has the active agency and who interprets and knows what is best for their subaltern hosts.¹⁴⁶²

As the purpose of the chapter has been to consider what hospitality could look like, it merits mentioning that hospitality between hosts and guests in tourism settings includes something as simple as paying a fair price for the tourism services.¹⁴⁶³ In this kind of context the payment of a fair price for accommodation and food could promote more mobile subject positions in very concrete ways. Even in a way that would allow the people hosting guests to also have a possibility to choose to travel as a tourist. Instead of proposing that travelling would require having lots of money, I *do* suggest that a prerequisite for more responsible travelling and visiting is to keep doing one's 'homework'.¹⁴⁶⁴ As discussed in the previous chapters,

1457 Vrsti 2013; see also Caton & Santos 2013.

1458 MacCannell 1976/1999; Pratt 1992; Simmons 2004.

1459 Caton & Santos 2013, 194.

1460 McEwan 2009, 301; Vrsti 2013, 84; Sammells 2014, 130-3.

1461 Paul Martin in 2000, a New Revolution in Nicaragua: Edu-Tourism! www.planeta.com website accessed 4 March, 2014.

1462 see also Mohanty 1999.

1463 Or in case the concept of *paying* sounds too banal in this context, the exchange of money and services could also be considered as an act of exchanging gifts. For discussions on exchanging gifts, see for instance Länsman 2004, Kuokkanen 2007; Pyyhtinen 2014.

1464 Sew Kuokkanen's (2007, 114-5) conceptualization of 'homework'. See also Sections 3.5. and 6.3. in this book.

the call for making homework means engaging in hyper-self-reflectivity, in Kapoor's¹⁴⁶⁵ words, about one's position and pre-assumptions about the other. In this context the homework would include considering, for instance, how and why the 'other's' welcome to self becomes self-evident. Has it been all tourism advertisement that has convinced us, the wealthy guests, to feel welcome to arrive whenever and wherever?¹⁴⁶⁶ I suggest that engaging in this homework could help to recognize how *choosing* to live on a shoestring is already a privilege as such which does not automatically disrupt the gaps between haves and have-nots. In fact, taking for granted that the other welcomes self, without hearing and welcoming the other, rather de-subjectifies the subaltern host.

7.4 Towards mutual welcoming

The purpose of this chapter was two-fold: first, to envision what hospitable encounters could look like, and second, to suggest how more spaces for ethical encounters could be opened. Based on the analysis of those encounters that the local hosts in San Ramón have given positive meanings to, I have focused on the issues of sharing time, sharing experiences and knowledge, and sharing space. While ethical encounters, at their best, can mean unconditionally open flow¹⁴⁶⁷ of ideas and experiences, they can also mean less asymmetrical mobility in the spaces where the conditions and responsibilities of welcoming become negotiated. While saying this, I agree with Derrida that the only pre-condition of ethical relations is the readiness to constantly re-negotiate the conditions and responsibilities of welcoming. In my opinion, the following quote from doña Hilda somewhat summarizes the essence of the hospitable space between ourselves. In our discussions about respectful encounters in one's home, doña Hilda explained:

1465 Kapoor 2004.

1466 Höckert 2014, 114.

1467 Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (in Veijola 2014, 76) approaches the idea of *flow* as 'the optimal experience' of being completely absorbed in one's being and doing.

...when they come, we do everything possible to discuss with the guests. But how to say (– –), we do not know who are the visitors who wish to share, and which do not. (– –) A little while ago there was a couple from Spain. I attended them, they told me that everything is well and the food is good. But what I observed was that they wanted to be alone: so we respected that. And at the moment of their departure, they told us that everything was well. We respect if the guests want to discuss, and also if they want to be alone. There are those like you who we discuss with and eat together with. We have learned to observe and to respect how the visitors prefer to be while they are here. (2013/42/F)

I propose that hospitable relations require what doña Hilda calls ‘observing and respecting’ how the other wants to be in these encounters.¹⁴⁶⁸ They require attention to the other, putting aside one’s pre-assumptions about the other and welcoming the other in discourse. Most importantly, these forms of togetherness means respecting and being attentive towards the welcome, and the *yes* of the other, as Levinasian philosophy suggests. As doña Hilda’s reflection proposes, welcoming the other in discourse does not always require actual speaking to each other. This is a theme of hospitable dwelling in silence, has been explored in Veijola’s¹⁴⁶⁹ research on *Towards Silent Communities*, where she discusses about the ideas of silent being-with and silent communities as an example of ethical plural for the future tourism hospitalities. Her¹⁴⁷⁰ research suggests that having a discussion or being together in silence, welcoming others means giving up one’s freedom of being a spontaneous subject who enters without asking. To translate this into the theoretical discussions in my study, it means unlearning the privilege of being a spontaneous host or spontaneous guest, when wishing to engage in respectful relationship with the other. Most of all, as Levinas and Derrida argue, readiness to be interrupted by the other is a mutual responsibility

1468 Levinas and Derrida call this as *attention* to the other. See, for instance, Derrida AEL 1999, 22.

1469 Veijola 2014.

1470 Ibid.; See also Derrida’s (AEL 1999, 23) thought on being as movement without movement.

and risk of both hosts and guests.¹⁴⁷¹ Hence, the call for this readiness is not only a question of good customer service, tolerance or patience towards the other, but a fundamental question of ethics.¹⁴⁷²

1471 Derrida AEL 1999, 29, 50-2.

1472 Ibid.

8 CONCLUSION

At the end of my last visit to San Ramón, in 2013, it was not easy to say goodbye to my host family and the local guides. I had received a small bag of freshly roasted local coffee and a warm-hearted note saying my family and I were welcome to return. For me this was a special gift, which I packed into my backpack with care. I think that this time my backpack had more space than when I first arrived in San Ramón in 2008. Back then, my bag was loaded not only with books on sustainable tourism development and conducting interviews, but also with developmentalism and desire to help. I have been unloading this backpack during the past years in order to make space for alternative ways of encountering the ‘other’.

The main question guiding my analysis in the present study has been: How do self and other, or hosts and guests welcome each other in participatory tourism encounters? I have analysed tourism encounters in the economically marginalized communities where the guests often arrive with an interest in helping their hosts. However, my analysis suggests that emancipatory intentions to help are not enough when what we are looking for are more responsible encounters in tourism settings.¹⁴⁷³ Drawing on postcolonial critique and a phenomenological approach, the study proposes that envisioning more ethical encounters between self and ‘other’ requires active decolonization of the epistemologies that dominate the field of tourism development. However, in addition to the potential for ‘epistemic violence’¹⁴⁷⁴, participatory tourism initiatives engender an ontological conflict in which the knowing and being together they espouse become dominated by individual subjects. In Levinas’ terms this could be described as a failure in welcoming the other.

1473 See also Vrasti 2013; Mostafanezhad 2013; Caton 2008; 2014, 196.

1474 See Spivak 1988, 281; Kuokkanen 2007.

It means that both dimensions of welcome and ethics might be missing: attention to and respect for the welcome *of* the other [subjective genitive] and saying ‘welcome’ *to* the other. In the course of this study I have followed Levinas’ and Derrida’s ideas on hospitality and drawn special attention to the prepositions placed between *welcome* and the *other*.¹⁴⁷⁵

In my theoretical framework I have approached the spheres between *welcome* and the *other* as the space where negotiations of hospitality, responsibility and participation take place. My research has located the notion of participation in the intersection of intersubjectivity, hospitality and ethics and in this way aimed to offer an alternative approach to examining the phenomenon of community participation. The study has explored how Levinas’ and Derrida’s notions of hospitality could be used as conceptual tools to acknowledge and challenge the possible limitations of our imaginings and to envision more ethical ways of encountering the ‘other’. Based on my analysis I argue that the ways in which tourism experts – including researchers – take for granted the unconditional welcome of rural communities can be understood as a sign of colonized imaginings and heightened levels of individualism. Hence, the study indicates that the first step in the process of ‘decolonizing minds’ is to become aware of different ways and contexts where these imaginings and ways of being continue to be produced.¹⁴⁷⁶ To put it differently, decolonizing relational spheres between the self and the other involves a readiness to interrupt self, and to make ontological and epistemological space for the other.

By telling the story of my longitudinal research in Nicaragua in this volume, I have sought to contribute to the processes of decolonizing our ways of knowing and acting where tourism is concerned.¹⁴⁷⁷ While community-based tourism development has been considered as an exceptional chance

1475 For explanation of prepositions between welcome and the other, please see Section 3.3., and Derrida AEL 1999, 23-4; 35. I have also discussed about these prepositions briefly in Veijola et al. 2014, 146.

1476 The same argument presented by Spivak 1987; Kuokkanen 2007; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

1477 For earlier research that has contributed to decolonization within tourism research, see Pratt 1992; Krippendorf 1987; Edensor 1998; Hall & Tucker 2004; Hollinshead 2004; Wearing & Wearing 2014; Wearing & Darcy 2011; Caton 2008; Tucker & Akama 2009; Tucker 2014; Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

to decolonize power relations within the tourism industries, my doubts about the ultimate fairness of this type of tourism have grown during the course of the study. I became convinced, corresponding to earlier studies by Butcher, Scheyvens, Goodwin and Wearing and Wearing, that the relations of domination should also be addressed within the participatory paradigm.¹⁴⁷⁸ However, in contrast to the most critical voices in tourism research¹⁴⁷⁹, I do not want to dismiss the participatory paradigm as such. Neither have I found it meaningful to create new ‘codes of conduct’ for tourism experts who involve us with community-based development.¹⁴⁸⁰ Instead, based on postcolonial philosophy and hermeneutic phenomenology, my study highlights the importance of openness between hosts and guests.

While saying this, I would hasten to point out that these two theoretical stances require acknowledging that the encounters between self and other are always asymmetrical.¹⁴⁸¹ My purpose is in no way to suggest that the call for more responsible ways of knowing and being could alone solve the structural problems causing inequality and impoverishment.¹⁴⁸² Rather, my study has addressed and examined the asymmetries of encounters between hosts and guests while striving for more inclusive ways of encountering the ‘other’. In doing so, I have sought to join, in Caton’s¹⁴⁸³ words’, the ‘explorations of our relationships to ourselves and others, and of the responsibilities we may hold of each front’.

I divided my research task – ‘deconstructing contemporary tourism development encounters and envisioning alternatives to these encounters’ – into following sub-questions: Why might participatory tourism encounters

1478 Butcher 2007; Scheyvens 2011, 71; Goodwin 2012; Wearing & Wearing 2014; And see also Cooke and Kothari’s (2001) critique of the *Tyranny of Participation*.

1479 Argument presented by Butcher 2012 in particular.

1480 Wearing and Wearing 2014 suggest that the encounters between local communities and tourism intermediaries require codes of conduct for ethical action. See Raffoul’s (2010, 1) work on responsibility, where he suggests that ethics today in general are approached less as a normative body of moral rules and more in terms of philosophical reflection on the meaning of ethics as such.

1481 Levinas 1969, 215-6; EI 1985, 98-9; Spivak 1987; Derrida & Rottenberg 2002.; see also Kuokkanen 2007, xvi.

1482 Vrasti 2013, 84; Spivak 1987.

1483 Caton 2014a, 196; see also Veijola et al. 2014; Höckert 2014.

lead to frustration and criticism among local communities, development practitioners and tourism researchers? Why do rural communities and tourism experts engage in participatory tourism development? How do the risks and responsibilities of participating become negotiated in rural tourism initiatives? How can research on local participation re-construct or de-construct otherness? What would it mean to move towards more ethical and hospitable encounters? I begin the chapter by answering these questions based on my analysis of participatory tourism development in Nicaragua. From these discussions I move to another level of abstraction to describe the ways in which this study contributes to the previous research in the participatory tourism paradigm. After that I will draw focus on the challenges and possibilities that shape the processes of decolonizing social relations. While doing this, I also address some of the limitations of this research. Before discussing the need for further research, I provide suggestions for applying the results in practice. Lastly, I return to reflect on the ways in which the notion of hospitality has redirected my own priorities from knowledge towards relations with the other.

I begin with the first sub-question: How has the notion of hospitality helped me analyse the expectations and disappointments related to community participation in tourism? If hospitality is a desire to make space for the other, for the guest, the ultimate form of open welcoming would be to leave one's home empty for the visitors to occupy on arrival.¹⁴⁸⁴ Although this sounds like a peculiar form of hospitality, it is actually almost a standard scenario in tourism. In the Global South in particular, it is common that beaches, streets and hotels are built exclusively for tourists.¹⁴⁸⁵ Although many guests like to partake of the 'local life', local hosts are also perceived as uninvited guests whose eager intentions to sell things or services detract from tourists' desire to enjoy their stay in otherwise pristine destinations.¹⁴⁸⁶ In order to avoid such 'disturbance', numerous tourists choose to relax in

1484 Derrida AEL 1999.

1485 Edensor 1998, 45-53; 150-63; Dicks 2003, 140; Mordt 2011; Blázquez & Cañada 2011; Veijola et al. 2014; Bianchi 2014.

1486 For a thought-provoking discussion of hosts' as 'uninvited guests', see McNaughton 2006.

all-inclusive resorts which are all-exclusive to unwanted local hosts.¹⁴⁸⁷

In this perspective community-based tourism is a radically alternative form of tourism as it is based on the possibility or desire to enjoy conviviality with local families. That is, in community-based tourism the 'native hosts' do not belong to the scenery, or serve as props, but form a pivotal part of the touristic experience.¹⁴⁸⁸ After nearly four decades of unsuccessful efforts to reduce poverty through conventional forms of tourism, community participation has been seen as a way to ensure that tourists' dollars would benefit economically marginalized groups and regions.¹⁴⁸⁹ As Chapter 2 of this research points out, in tourism research, community participation has been primarily associated with the alternative development approach, which celebrates people-based, locally owned, top-down initiatives for change.¹⁴⁹⁰ However, community participation has been both defended and criticized with a wide range of arguments. In my view, these debates have used primarily pragmatic and industry-based arguments to justify whether local participation can or cannot promote successful tourism development, further environmental conservation or support the community's cultural heritage.

The fifth chapter of the study discusses the ways in which Nicaraguan government, NGOs, and development aid organizations have promoted community-based tourism initiatives in order to spread benefits from the tourism sector into rural areas.¹⁴⁹¹ These kinds of tourism programmes and projects are seen to entail more solidarity, communality and equality than the conventional forms of tourism developed on the country's Pacific coastline. Based on my interviews with tourism experts and development officials, I claim that many rural tourism initiatives in Nicaragua have been built on perceptions of tourism as easy and profitable business.¹⁴⁹² The visions of ease and profitability are based on the notion that host families can

1487 Edensor 1998, 156-7; See also Dielemans 2008.

1488 Urry 1990; Dicks 2003, 136-143; Veijola 2014; see also Simmons 2004; Edensor 1998, 2009

1489 Turner & Ash 1976, 53 in Higgins Desbiolles 2006, 1193; de Kadt 1979; Cañada & Gascón 2007; Schilcher 2007, 59; Scheyvens 2011; Jänis 2011; Pleumarom 2012.

1490 Telfer 2014, 54-9.

1491 Cañada et al. 2006; Cañada 2010; INTUR 2009a, 2010b.

1492 INTUR 2012b.

receive paying guests in their private homes. However, as I have highlighted throughout the study, tourism does not become easy simply by virtue of its taking place in people's homes.¹⁴⁹³ Experiences from San Ramón indicate that the outcome can even be quite the opposite. Drawing on Derrida's¹⁴⁹⁴ conceptualization of hospitality in particular, I have suggested that opening one's home always includes a risk for the host. In fact, one central dimension of coloniality is the way the guests abuse the hospitality of their hosts.

Most of the tourism experts who participated in this study seemed to underestimate the variety of resources that tourism development might require from local families and communities. The interviews I conducted suggest that a strong belief in the promise of rural tourism development – especially when held collectively – can lead to trivialization of possible risks and challenges in tourism development. On this basis, the study underlines that, like mass tourism, the development of supposedly responsible forms of small-scale tourism should include explicit negotiations about the conditions and risks of community involvement in tourism activities. It appears that without adequate information about the possible impacts of tourism development it is difficult for local families to make informed decisions.¹⁴⁹⁵ Struck by the nature of tourism development in San Ramón, I call for heightened caution among tourism experts who would recommend to rural communities they should invest their time and resources in supposedly sustainable tourism projects.

The examples from San Ramón reveal the risks of dependency in participatory tourism projects.¹⁴⁹⁶ While the local hosts waited, hoping that tourists would return to their home communities, representatives from international NGOs, development aid organizations and the Nicaraguan tourism ministry continued planning and starting new, similar kinds of tourism initiatives across the country. More than ten years had passed since the families in San Ramón were persuaded to take advantage of the great possibilities of tourism development by opening their doors to tourism experts and tourists.

1493 Grit 2010; Hultman & Andersson Cederholm 2010.

1494 Derrida AEL 1999, 2000.

1495 Mettäinen et al. 2009.

1496 The same argument made by Zapata et al. in 2011.

While the combination of rural poverty, Nicaraguan hospitality and rapid growth in the tourism sector have been presented almost as a ‘match made in heaven’, I consider it problematic that local communities are expected to stay on hold, welcoming unconditionally all the possible guests. I can imagine that my sentiments are shared by the members of one rural community on the Caribbean coast of Nicaragua: after a few years of anxious waiting for tourists and tourists’ dollars, they tore down the huts they had built for tourists and used them as firewood.

My analysis indicates that the encounters between hosts and guests in rural communities are shaped by two contradictory suppositions. While the first is based on a romantic idea of traditional forms of hospitality that exist in rural communities in particular, the second highlights the inadequacy of material conditions in local homes.¹⁴⁹⁷ Thus, although Nicaraguan tourism policy documents celebrate the hospitality to be found in rural areas, in practice the efforts to commodify local hospitality have regularly turned into a pile of disappointments.¹⁴⁹⁸ In my analysis I have examined the different perceptions of these developments from both points of view, that of the tourism officials and that of the members of the rural communities. Even though the local hosts recognized the importance of warm hospitality and material improvement, they came to consider tourism a rather complex process. In analysing the ways in which conditions and risks of participating become negotiated, I have drawn on interviews with the local hosts in San Ramón as well as with the tourism developers, focusing on different experiences of tourism developers’ aims to modify local homes and communities into tourism sites. While the hosts in San Ramón found development experts’ help useful in the earlier stages of tourism development, they later became drained by the continuous flow of advice. Visiting experts readily commented on nearly anything that they regarded as inappropriate, inadequate, inauthentic, tacky or rustic in comparison to quality indicators which ‘measure’ the minimum requirements for being able to welcome guests.

1497 Both ways of giving meanings to rural tourism encounters re-construct unequal power relations and *representations of otherness*.

1498 See also Chalip & Costa 2010; Sammels 2014.

This analysis has helped me to realize that despite – or actually because of – the good intentions that the visiting experts carry, these guests (read: we) are likely to dominate the negotiations between us and the members of rural communities. Spivak¹⁴⁹⁹ aptly observes that the question in these kinds of settings is not so much one of what the ‘other’ says, but what the self can hear. The example from San Ramón suggests that tourism experts might trivialize locals’ opinions that differ from the experts’ previous suppositions. Rather, the encounters are shaped by experts’ perceptions of tourism as an easy source of income – as something that economically marginalized rural communities simply cannot *not* want’.¹⁵⁰⁰ In these settings, tourism experts’ responsibility becomes to teach the rural communities to take advantage of the tourism sector. To put things in somewhat different terms, the processes of promoting community participation the spheres and spaces of dialogue are often dominated by tourism experts’ perceptions of tourism, of participation and of the ‘other’. I consider this problematic as the local hosts’ experiences – and their subjectivity as the subjects of welcome – are shaped in the encounters with tourism officials. These encounters can result, as in the case of San Ramón, in local hosts doubting their possibilities to participate in the negotiations where the conditions for hosting and welcoming become negotiated. Thus, contrary to their stated aim, community-based tourism projects include a risk that ‘the subjects of welcome’ will become de-subjectified.

The ways in which many tourism officials and experts (including researchers) overlook the challenges of participating in pre-planned projects can be seen as a form of silencing the ‘other’, that is, epistemic violence. The study suggests that neglecting the privileged¹⁵⁰¹ position that we tourism experts have – and neglecting the risk of silencing the ‘other’ – undermine the possibilities of promoting more responsible encounters within tourism. In rural tourism settings the development encounters and epistemic violence occur in people’s homes, where tourism developers both encourage and evaluate

1499 Spivak 1988. 283-4; see also Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

1500 Spivak 1993, 284; see also Eriksson Baaz’s 2005, 176.

1501 I agree with Higgins-Desbiolles and Powes Whyte (2013) that the recent critical turn in tourism, what is known also as hopeful tourism, must address the issue of privilege when researching and supporting marginalized communities.

local families. In San Ramón, the operation of 'domestic epistemic violence' was most evident in projects where tourism experts ignored local resistance to risky loans, or local resistance to receiving volunteers for free. In my view, 'domestic epistemic violence' occurred in situations where the guests exclude local hosts from the processes in which the conditions and risks of welcoming were negotiated; that is, the guests continued to master the calculations and discussions of what kind of tourism development was desirable.

My research indicates that the guests' accounts of local hospitality in rural communities, on one hand, and of the supposedly uncomplicated nature of tourism activities, on the other, trivialized the experiences of the local hosts. In practice, many of the guests' overlooked the local hosts' arguments, such as 'We give the visitors our best', 'These are the conditions we have', 'We cannot improve the material conditions for the guests' or 'We do not want to take new loans for tourism development'. In other words, it seems like the experts may take over the role of host in rural tourism projects, and fail to make space for the local voices and choices.¹⁵⁰² Or could it be that these kinds of development encounters lack open dialogue when the experts focus on filling the hosts' homes with their 'gifts'? My purpose is not to deny the possibility that gifts of things and ideas could be highly valuable to their recipient. Rather, I would like to question the ego- and ethnocentric assumption that the self can *know* the exact needs of the 'other'. This dovetails nicely with a question that we pose in our book on *untidy guests*:¹⁵⁰³ What might we miss when we worry about organizing everything in 'the right' order?

In this study I have approached tourism development encounters from different perspectives in order to understand why participatory tourism encounters have caused so much frustration and prompted so much criticism. One of the great contradictions in these kinds of tourism programmes can be found in the different ways marginality and the lack of material progress attract travellers and tourism developers. The encounters between these guests are based on different kinds of expectations regarding the local contexts and local hosts. While some of the guests travel with a concern

1502 See Derrida 1999, 15-6; Kuokkanen 2007, 138.

1503 See Germann Molz & Gibson 2007; 5-6, Veijola et al. 2014.

that the authenticity of local life might be under constant attack by material progress,¹⁵⁰⁴ some take a more active role in advocating for material progress. At the same time, it is obvious that while all the local hosts in San Ramón valued material progress, they did so in various ways. In fact, as McEwan¹⁵⁰⁵ points, it is already a good step forward towards decolonizing imaginings to recognize that individuals and communities hold and utilize a complex multiplicity of identities and values depending on the particular circumstances.¹⁵⁰⁶

However, engaging in this discussion, as Vrasti¹⁵⁰⁷ warns, gives rise to ethical dilemmas such as denying the distribution of material assets in order to preserve communities' cultural diversity, or rejecting people's creative agency to adapt their cultural and natural sources to changing social needs. The challenge is to acknowledge and embrace the messiness without falling into a form of multiculturalism that can lead to romantification and further exclusion of the 'other'. According to Vrasti and McEwan, this risk is always palpable in development circles, foreign policies, academic production of knowledge and popular culture; needless to say, the risk exists also in tourism research and practices.¹⁵⁰⁸ Despite the 'perils' involved, it is necessary to consider whose ideas of tourism development and material progress are being heard and followed.¹⁵⁰⁹ Most importantly, when the local hosts are represented through their adequacy – or lack thereof – as tourism entrepreneurs, these representations freeze local cultures and supersede rural communities' active agency. These depictions then taint future encounters, with the other being met as someone who is 'not quite there yet' – almost as a memory from the past. Hence, rethinking tourism¹⁵¹⁰ encounters

1504 Vrasti 2013, 84; As Vrasti (2013, 71) points out, this false dichotomy can strengthen the elitist cliché 'they are poor but happy' and cause neglecting the material needs of the others and denying the other something that the self has. See also McEwan 2009, 301; Caton 2014b, 133.

1505 McEwan 2009, 256.

1506 For these discussions in tourism studies, see the excellent new article *Tourism and decolonisation: Locating research and self* by Chambers and Buzinde 2015. See also Tucker 2014.

1507 Vrasti 2013, 84.

1508 Ibid.; McEwan 2009, 31; See also Simmons 2004; Hall & Tucker 2004; Hulme 2008; Escobar 2012; Hollinshead 2007.

1509 See Saxena 1998, 2011.

1510 see Inayatallah, 1995; Caton 2012; 2014.

requires more pronounced acknowledgement of the different perceptions and cultural values that guide the visions of what hospitable and ethical encounters consist of.¹⁵¹¹

How has this study contributed to academic discussions on community participation in the cultural studies of tourism? While the research originated in my interest in rural communities' roles in tourism, my intention has not been to advocate for community-based tourism development as a 'model' for poverty reduction or community development. I must also leave it to others with more insights into value chains and economic trickle-down effects to argue for and explain the economic implications of including local communities in tourism networks.¹⁵¹² I also find that any efforts intending to replace 'the grand narrative' of tourism growth with another universal solution could be seen as anathema. In other words, I do not find it meaningful to offer universal answers to questions of development or progress. It is in this same vein that Singh¹⁵¹³ argues that 'progressive alternative to current models of participatory development could be seen as a repetition of the same mistake that the scholars are attempting to remedy'. In fact, I suggest that current debates in tourism research should move beyond the dichotomy of promoting or condemning particular forms of tourism as models for sustainable development.¹⁵¹⁴ I find it more important, for instance, to spread the word about the lost hospitality in development encounters, that is, to call for hospitality and openness in the encounters that take place in the name of tourism development.

Based on my reading of previous research on community participation in tourism, I argue that the discussions of participation in tourism studies have to a great extent failed to notice the different ideas about the basis of the social.¹⁵¹⁵ For instance, it has not been openly discussed how and why

1511 Higgins-Desbiolles 2006, 1203.

1512 For research on economic significance of rural and community-based tourism initiatives, see for instance, Fleischer & Felsenstein 2000; Hall 2007; Mitchell & Ashley 2010, 112-34; Jänis 2011, 103-6; Goodwin et al. 2014.

1513 Singh 2012, 117.

1514 For example of these kinds of debates, see *Critical Debates in Tourism* (Singh ed. 2012).

1515 For exceptions, please see Jamal & Stronza's (2008) *Dwelling in the Peruvian Amazon* and Tucker 2014.

the contemporary search for responsibility in tourism tends to prioritize the individual subject.¹⁵¹⁶ Moreover, there has been only limited interest in questioning the Western tradition built on the distinctions between object and subject, developed and underdeveloped, and so on.¹⁵¹⁷ Unfortunately, the mantra of sustainability – while not throwing us off track – has not helped in addressing the question of subjectivities in tourism development.¹⁵¹⁸ What is more, blinded and brainwashed as the field is by the idea of homo oeconomicus, even the search for ethics in tourism has been dedicated to creating codes of conduct in order to make the business more ethical.¹⁵¹⁹ In these frameworks ethics are primarily seen as a management tool or as something needed in order to restrict the freedom of spontaneous individuals.¹⁵²⁰ In sum, when it comes to theoretical discussions about local participation – about being and doing together – one alternative to dismissing the concept as such is to undertake to disrupt some of the socially constructed boundaries between the self and the other.¹⁵²¹

In saying this, the study has taken seriously the rising voices of post-development thinkers who encourage us to look not only beyond economic growth, but also beyond the idea and rhetoric of development and its various modifiers – ‘sustainable’, ‘empowering’, ‘participatory’.¹⁵²² Some authors have argued that these three concepts are ‘essentially contested’; that is, it

1516 Also tourist guide books or shiny travel magazines, among others, also strongly contribute to re-constructing the individual freedom of a sovereign subject and a *flâneur* (see for instance Urry 1990; Jokinen & Veijola, 1997, 38; Huijbens and Benediktsson 2013, 201). However, there should not be given any special awards to the tourism industries for celebrating and always proceeding from the subject. In fact, Pyyhtinen (2009, 121) explains that, sociology included, ‘there has hardly been any place left for the relational mode of the social’, for coexistence and ‘being-with’.

1517 Smith, M. 2009b, 613–630; examples of well-needed expectations, see Aithcinson 2001; Caton 2008; Tucker 2010, 928; Ankor & Wearing 2012.

1518 However, while saying this, I acknowledge that the discussions of empowerment forms a central part in the discussions of social and cultural sustainability in tourism (Scheyvens 1999, 2003; Cole 2006; Tuulentie & Mettiäinen 2007, Höckert 2009; Hashimoto 2014). See also Saarinen’s (2006) research on *Traditions of Sustainability*.

1519 Smith & Duffy 2003; Nykänen & Veijola 2013, 91.

1520 Smith 2009a..

1521 See also Salazar 2013; and Tucker’s (2014, 201) thought on fluidity of subject position.

1522 Jamal et al 2003; Schilcher 2007; Sharpley 2011; Zapata et al. 2011, 23; Escobar 2012; Alt 2013; Chandler 2013.

is not possible for scholars to agree on a meaning for them because they approach such development from different epistemological premises or with radically different world-views.¹⁵²³ These authors help us to recognize the risks of using these kinds of concepts in such radically different ways that shared knowledge becomes impossible.¹⁵²⁴ Hence my study has aimed to acknowledge the previous critique of community participation in tourism and to gain understanding what kinds of world-views the authors of that criticism espouse.

When considering the possible disposal or replacement of these concepts, it is good to notice that the idea of participation might not be as new or modern as the tourism or development literature would like us to believe.¹⁵²⁵ Where participation took place thousands of years ago, for instance, by collecting food, playing and eating¹⁵²⁶ together, today there exists a noticeably wider range of forms: physical, virtual, one-on-one, family, team, community, municipal elections, corporations and so on. Hence, at least the most basic unit and case of participation – two people encountering each other – is not something that scholars could dispose.¹⁵²⁷ I also find it ambiguous to treat participation as a tap that only some can turn on or off. Hence, my research on tourism encounters in San Ramón contributes to the academic discussions that find it ill-devised to dispose the idea of participation as such.¹⁵²⁸ The present study claims that one of the prevailing challenges in the academic discussions on community participation may be the failure to fully acknowledge ethical paradigms which guide our perceptions of participation¹⁵²⁹. As a result, the idea of participating has lost its connections to different ideological and philosophical meanings of being, doing and knowing together.¹⁵³⁰

1523 For different epistemological premises and essentially contested concepts, see Porta & Keating 2008, 4; see also Cornwall & Eade (eds.) 2010.

1524 *Ibid.*, 2.

1525 Henkel & Stirrat 2001, 170-1; Cornwall & Brock 2005; Cohen & Uphoff 2011, 34; Singh 2012, 117.

1526 Tökkäri 2010, 32.

1527 *Ibid.* 30.

1528 See for instance, Singh 2012; Dredge et al. 2013.

1529 For exceptions, see Jamal & Camargo 2011; Dredge 2011.

1530 Leal 2010, 89; 2011.

The last sub-question I address is ‘What would it mean to move towards more ethical and hospitable encounters?’ An alternative formulation could have been ‘In which ways might the Levinasian idea of ethics differs from contemporary approaches to responsible tourism encounters?’ More than anything else, what reading Levinas has helped me to do is to notice that the debates on the participatory paradigm in tourism have not been divided only on the questions of culture and market, but also along the dimension of communality and individualism. His philosophy on *totality* and *infinity* encourages acknowledging the difference between ontologies of *totality* based on conditions and clear-cut subject positions and the metaphysics of *infinity*, which calls for openness and receptivity. Based on my analysis I have suggested that the frustration with and critique of participatory approaches in tourism studies and practices might spring from the ontologies that favour towards totalizing, dualistic ways of being and knowing.¹⁵³¹ My contributions to discussions on participation that call for openness and serendipity are motivated by an urge to envision alternatives to essentializing ideas of participation.¹⁵³² Here my research has primarily built on the previous articulations of alternative ontologies in our volume *Disruptive Tourism and Its Untidy Guests*.¹⁵³³ In that book, we argue:

all tidying up – no matter how well intentioned – sweeps the generative possibilities of tourism under the rug and ensures that we will continue to repeat existing patterns of governance and inequality.¹⁵³⁴

Based on Levinas¹⁵³⁵ works, I have argued in this study that participation – and hospitality – based on regulated techniques or knowledge can be seen

1531 I suggest that the most skeptical scholars on community participation base their ideas on these kinds of ontologies of being; see for instance Butcher 2009; Goodwin 2012.

1532 These studies could include, for instance, those by Jamal & Stronza 2008; Singh S. 2012; Tucker 2014.

1533 Veijola et al 2014.

1534 Ibid. 3.

1535 Levinas T&I 1969; OB 1998; In the earlier phases of my theoretical exploration, I drew inspiration in particular from tourism researcher Mick Smith’s (2009ab) reflections on Levinasian writings.

as a form of domination. Accordingly, I have suggested that the possibilities and ethics of participation lie in the *impossibility* of controlling, deciding or determining the conditions for participation.¹⁵³⁶ This means approaching responsible encounters as something that cannot be pre-planned; rather, the responsibilities between self and other become constantly negotiated in these encounters as such.¹⁵³⁷ Thus, Levinasian¹⁵³⁸ idea of ethics calls for a readiness to interrupt self as an individually responsible subject. In fact, perhaps one of the most striking ‘results’ of this work that I want to carry with me in the future is the importance of being ready to interrupt self.¹⁵³⁹ In the context of this study, I have found this readiness highly applicable to development practitioners who are searching for more inclusive forms of community participation.

The ideas of openness and undedicability encourage us to seek more unfinished designs of participation and development. In research projects and the context of international aid alike this means being prepared for the unexpected and being prepared to be unprepared.¹⁵⁴⁰ In Derrida’s words, as I understand it, this means ‘leaving the door open for the incalculable’ and being ready to interrupt one’s desire to master or host the negotiation.¹⁵⁴¹ Based on my analysis in San Ramón, I have suggested that the present-day participatory tourism development projects depend on the readiness of the local hosts in rural communities to make space for the possible guest. Hence,

1536 See Derrida AEL 1999, 35. Derrida writes “This spectral ”possibility” is not, however, the abstraction of a liminar pervertibility. It would be, rather, the *impossibility* of controlling, deciding, or determining a limit, the *impossibility* of situating, by means of criteria, norms, or rules, a tenable threshold separating pervertibility from perversion.”

1537 Höckert et al. forthcoming.

1538 For the significance of interruption, see Derrida AEL 1999, 51-2; and in Levinas T&I 1969, 39, 82-4.

1539 I experience that Zygmund Bauman’s thoughts on dialogue corresponds well to LeVina’s and Derrida’s discussions of interruption as Bauman (no date) argues that we have to enter to a dialogue with a readiness to be wrong. Source for this argument, Sveriges Radio, *Filosofiska Rummet* (7 June 2015) Bauman, Sennett och dialogens konst. <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/>.

1540 While saying this, I am aware of the structural problems that limit the openness of participatory research and participatory development projects, that is, that the access to finance requires well-planned project documents which pre-define the results of the intervention.

1541 Derrida AEL 1999, 2002; Kuokkanen 2007; The concept of undedicability elaborated by Baker (2010) in his analysis on humanitarian interventions.

this continuum of readiness would allow movement towards more mobile and fluid subject positions between ourselves. This recalls with Alexander Grit's¹⁵⁴² idea of *hospitality*, according to which the spaces of hospitality make it possible for 'the roles of the host and guest [to] alternate and play with future potentialities'.¹⁵⁴³ Similarly to Grit's exploration of hospitality, ethical encounters become socially, intersubjectively, constructed and hence cannot be, in Levinas' words, 'said'. The only aspect of encounters that can be said is the intersubjective nature of the relation with the other, which means acknowledgement of the various ways in which being can take place between self and the other. This is tantamount to saying that ethics of hospitality or ethics of participation welcome new ways of being and doing togetherness among self and others.

I have considered Spivak's¹⁵⁴⁴ postcolonial critique particularly relevant for the participatory paradigm. Instead of treating participatory development as something 'natural, good or incontestable', she encourages us to consider 'Why is something being developed in the first place?' and 'by whom?' Spivak's idea does not allow celebration even when everything works out; it demands that one asks 'for whom is it working?'¹⁵⁴⁵ Similar kinds of questions are asked in present-day Nicaragua where the entire political scene and the opportunity for 'citizen participation' have been taken over by President Ortega and his wife, Rosario Murillo, and their supporters.¹⁵⁴⁶ Moreover, while writing these last pages of my book, a great number of Nicaraguans are protesting against the mega-project of constructing a canal across the entire country. It is estimated that the project, run by a Chinese millionaire with permission from the ruling Sandinista government, will dislocate thousands of Nicaraguans from their homes and to cause an as yet unknown amount of environmental damage.¹⁵⁴⁷ Hence, the experiences of *solidarity* and *participation* – slogans celebrated by the president couple – vary greatly among Nicaraguans.

1542 Grit 2014.

1543 Veijola et al. 2014, 13.

1544 Spivak 1988; Kapoor, 2004, 642; see also Eriksson Baaz 2005.

1545 Ibid.; Spivak, 1988; Sharpe & Spivak 2002, 623; See also Saxena 1998.

1546 Envio.

1547 It would be interesting to discuss about 'Nicaraguan hospitality' in this context.

However, would it not be hasty to claim that the Nicaraguans who are not benefitting from the governments' actions are *not* participating in current development? For instance, are protesting and different forms of resistance excluded from participation? Is participation reserved for those who agree with each other and with pre-planned development interventions? In fact, is it possible that resistance often becomes overlooked in development settings?¹⁵⁴⁸ In my view, this has been the case at least in tourism studies that have called for active local participation.¹⁵⁴⁹ Based on my analysis of rural tourism development in Nicaragua, I propose that we tourism experts – the 'professional knowers'¹⁵⁵⁰ in tourism – must be ready to question the persistent perceptions of tourism development as something always good and desirable. That is, the search for more ethical forms of tourism cannot be based on an assumption that the others will always say 'yes' to tourism without further discussions about the possible reasons to say 'no'.

In addition to the research on participation and ethics within tourism studies, my study has drawn inspiration from the discussions of postcolonial imaginings, representations and world-making power in tourism academia.¹⁵⁵¹ This has meant questioning the Western epistemic positions that have a history of subordinating other cultures and maintaining the dichotomies between self and the other.¹⁵⁵² The desire to study and know the 'other' is something that becomes visible when formulating research questions and even more when defining the units of analysis and levels of analysis associated with one's chosen theoretical approach. The most typical 'units of analysis' in the social sciences are individuals, groups or institutions, whereas scholars in international relations, for example, often focus their analysis on entire nations or transnational organizations. Although these generalizations might be needed in order to be able to communicate about

1548 Seppälä 2013.

1549 For studies on resistance in tourism, see George et al. 2009, 58-9, 89-93; Pleumarom 2012, 90-1; For more on resistance in the context of tourism and environmental conservation, see Jamal et al. 2003.

1550 Term used by Caton 2013, 342.

1551 Hollinshead 2004; 2009; Hall & Tucker 2004; Tucker 2009; Caton 2008, 2013; Vrasti 2013.

1552 Ibid.; Hiddleston 2009, 98.

them, such conceptualizations require that one question the level at which the explanations and theories relating to these categories are expected to work. Especially those drawing on postcolonial theory have taken it upon themselves to point out the consequences of treating others as homogeneous groups, such as developing countries, the poor and women. While many of these categories are seen as necessary in order to study, analyse, represent these ‘others’, it is worth remembering that these categories are more than temporary constructs of academic research: they reflect and shape discourses that take place outside academia.¹⁵⁵³

My search for decolonizing methodologies has been based on Spivak’s and Kuokkanen’s writings about the ways in which our desire to ‘know’ the other – or to understand the life of the other – can be seen as an ideology of conquest, control and possession. I have considered this epistemic position as highly contradictory to the hermeneutic task of ethnographic scholarship, which has encouraged me to envision more hospitable methodologies that can disrupt one’s privileged position to study and represent the other.¹⁵⁵⁴ During the course of this study, I became convinced that the discussions on the ethics of academic research would gain from explicit acknowledgement of *why* we consider it important to study and represent the other. For instance, the scholars who promote participatory research methodologies are among those who have taken this question seriously by suggesting that the research agendas should better reflect the balanced interests of all partners involved in the research.¹⁵⁵⁵ I agree with these researchers, and hope that I will be able to learn more about participatory research methods in the future. However, during the course of this research in San Ramón, I had to give up on the goal of finding this kind of balance in my own work.¹⁵⁵⁶ Although I had hoped to be able to promote more open dialogue between different actors *during* my fieldwork visits, local hosts’ exhaustion amid the steady

1553 See Hollinshead 2004, Caton 2013.

1554 Tucker 2009; Jennings 2009; Hollinshead 2009; Caton 2008.; Dredge & Hales, 2012, 420-3

1555 See also Baumgartner et al. 2004, 208; Dredge & Hales 2012; Garcia-Rosell 2013; Haanpää et al. 2014; Hakkarainen, forthcoming.

1556 See Caton’s (2014) research on ‘Making messes with constructivism and critical theory’.

flow of new participatory initiatives made me change my plans.¹⁵⁵⁷ Hence, my study has not led to any significant changes in tourism development, nor does it provide results directly applicable at the local level. Although I want to share the main thoughts of this study especially with the people who contributed to developing them further, it would be, in my view, very contradictory to provide any guidelines or recommendations for action for the local families in San Ramón.¹⁵⁵⁸ Instead, I hope that this study could contribute to more open and responsible (tourism development) encounters between self and the other in the future.

Future studies on local participation should include more reflection on the representations and subject positions that these studies construct.¹⁵⁵⁹ Normative studies in particular – the ones that criticize social processes and institutions and point out a way towards better ones – become more fruitful when the units and levels of analysis are kept fluid.¹⁵⁶⁰ This suggestion is based on my own eye-opening experience of changing the units of analysis from *individuals and communities* (the first phases of the study) to *encounters* (the later phases of the study). This also meant broadening my level of analysis from tourism development in San Ramón in two different directions: to more general encounters within supposedly responsible tourism development and to more micro-level encounters between self and other. Moreover, once I had turned my focus on encounters, I became aware that almost every element of life can be treated as a valuable source of data.¹⁵⁶¹ It was no longer meaningful to argue that interviews, field-notes and policy documents alone were shaping my assumptions and interpretations. For instance, the way Cesar Castañeda¹⁵⁶² describes conducting fieldwork

1557 Ibid.

1558 By saying this I mean that the results that I will share with the communities are not advices or guidelines for action. However, I will send the book to the participants in Nicaragua with thanks and summarizing thoughts.

1559 For instance, is the researcher's purpose to describe how people are or how they tend to act? Or who do we talk about when we refer to local communities who should or should not be involved in tourism development? Does these researchers speak about all the 'local people' in the world?

1560 For definitions of normative research, see Porta & Keating 2008, 355.

1561 Wilson 2014, 224; see also Vrasti 2010, 85; Ranta 2014.

1562 Castañeda 2006.

as *being* in the fieldwork has encouraged me to reflect on my experiences of excitement, happiness, disappointment, frustration, anger and confusion while I have been collecting the ‘real’ data for my analysis.

Despite the abundance of the different sorts of data, I consider that my data could have been enriched with more recordings from the actual physical encounters between rural community members and tourism experts. Instead of these kinds of recordings, I have analysed transcribed interviews in which different participants describe their experiences of these encounters and also the notes from my fieldwork diary, where I describe my own observations and experiences of the encounters.¹⁵⁶³ On the one hand, the developers’ visits were often so brief that there was not really time or space for group interviews; on the other, I considered that recording meetings between local hosts and tourism developers could have added unnecessary tension and reserve to these situations. In any case, I feel that there exists a need to explore new possibilities to collect and analyse data on development encounters.¹⁵⁶⁴

In this study I have considered hermeneutic phenomenology a suitable and rich approach to analysing the data on the different meanings that people give to tourism development encounters. Not least, the approach encouraged me to question my pre-assumptions on what I expected to ‘find’ through the analysis.¹⁵⁶⁵ This kind of reflection is also much needed in postcolonial studies, which easily directs one’s focus merely to unequal power relations between self and the other. I agree with Pernecky, Jamal¹⁵⁶⁶ and Edelheim¹⁵⁶⁷ that hermeneutic phenomenology has remained under-used in tourism research, or applied primarily for exploring tourists’ experiences. Pernecky and Jamal¹⁵⁶⁸ highlight the importance of understanding the philosophical background of discussions on phenomenology, in particular the fundamen-

1563 Some of the meetings were recorder, such as the workshop we organized in San Ramón in March, 2012.

1564 In direct communication with Monika Büthcer, she brought up a great idea of using conversation analysis in order to gain more detailed understanding about different ways communication takes place in one-to-one encounters.

1565 See Caton 2013 on epistemic encounters *before, now* and *after*.

1566 Pernecky & Jamal 2010.

1567 Edelheim 2007.

1568 Pernecky & Jamal 2010, 1061-5.

tal differences between Husserl's and Heidegger's writings. I acknowledge that the methodological part of my study could have paid more attention to Levinas' reliance on both of these thinkers. Another shortcoming of this study – partly related to the above issue – is the way I have disregarded the interconnections between the hermeneutic circle, historicity and the Levinasian conceptualization of *trace* – of the 'face as a trace'.¹⁵⁶⁹

Indeed, perhaps one of the biggest challenges for me has been to find a balance between engaging with theoretical discussions on hospitality and ethics and presenting the analysis of rural tourism development in Nicaragua. I have realized the risk of diving too deep in exploring the influence of Levinas' idea of ethics on postcolonial critique or tracing his contributions to Dussel's writings on Latin American liberation theology or to Freire's liberation pedagogy.¹⁵⁷⁰ However, I feel that if I had focused more on these discussions, I would have done it at the expense of describing and analysing the empirical context in Nicaragua. It is also possible that my interest in Levinas' influence on Latin American schools of thought is partly based on my desire to justify why I have drawn on European philosophers to explain what has been happening in the Nicaraguan context.¹⁵⁷¹

Thus, I admit that one of the greatest contradictions of this study is its relatively limited recognition of Latin American subaltern scholars and post-development thinkers who have presented critiques of Western philosophy and the Western episteme similar to those put forward by Levinas, Derrida and Spivak. However, although I would have wanted to give more discursive space for Latin American intellectuals, such as Freire, Dussel, Mignolo and Escobar, it was not these thinkers who initially offered me the

1569 Derrida AEL 1999, 53; see Levinas *The Trace of the Other / La Trace de l'Autre* 1963; For analysis of trace in Levinas' work, see Bloechl (2000). In connection to Levinas' connections to methodology, Drabinski (2013, 19) writes '...Levinas work has been, from the beginning, about the concreteness of encounter where the Other exceeds my grasp, placing all of those items of stability, control, and solidification in the an-archic and the *trace*. (Italics added) On *trace* between Levinas and Spivak, see Drabinski 2013, 68.

1570 See for instance, Morrow & Torres (2002) *Reading Freire and Habermas*.

1571 I am fully aware of the ambiguity of doing this, not least because of the Eurocentrism of Levinas' writings, his disturbing view on relations between men and women, and the fact that he most likely would have approached Nicaraguans as 'the other others'.

new perspective on tourism development encounters. The fact that I came across Levinas', Derrida's and Spivak's thinking first is not a coincidence taking into account that I have studied tourism research only in northern Europe, where we are more familiar with European (and North American) thinkers. All in all, one of the reasons why I wanted to visit Nicaragua with these three philosophers on ethical subjectivity was my gratitude for the new viewpoints I had learned from them. While the strongest argument that supports Levinas' and Derrida's important role in this research journey rests on their fascinating discussions on hospitality and ethics, they also succeeded in making me question my position in ethnographic studies like this.

Here it merits mention that Levinas' ethical philosophy is only one among many visions that can be used to approach participatory encounters. The opportunity to dwell on these discussions has made me aware of the unlimited forms and possibilities of participation. In my view, categorizing the participatory paradigm as a *passé* approach to development includes a palpable risk of throwing out the baby with the bathwater.¹⁵⁷² To avoid this happening it would be necessary to trace the more ancient and radical roots of participation where it is seen as a starting point instead of a goal.¹⁵⁷³ I have argued in this study that the participatory paradigms in tourism and development studies have become disconnected, for instance, from the neo-Marxist philosophies of liberation, including Freire's liberation pedagogy.¹⁵⁷⁴ A great exception is the master's thesis on solidarity tourism in Nicaragua – including one of the communities in San Ramón – written by Daniel McRoberts. As Freire's thought has gained ground in the context of tourism education¹⁵⁷⁵, it could also help us to widen our understanding of different ways of developing tourism. Hence, my somewhat idealistic vision of the future includes a view where, on the one hand, critical pedagogy spreads beyond classrooms to new spaces of learning and participating¹⁵⁷⁶ and, on the other, the idea of local participation in tourism spreads beyond economically marginalized rural

1572 See also Hickey & Mohan 2004.

1573 Leal 2011, 71.

1574 Telfer 2009, 154-5; see Gramsci 1971; Bianchi 2009; Dussel 2012.

1575 Jamal 2004; Belhassen & Caton (2011) on Critical Pedagogy in tourism studies.

1576 Ibid.

communities. More concretely, critical pedagogy can be used to develop new participant-driven research methodologies and planning tools, and in this way spark awareness of the prejudices related to tourism and participation. In addition to the importance of unfinished project designs, there exists a need for new ways to disrupt the dualistic oppositions between students and teachers.

While my first research plans for this doctoral thesis underlined the importance of understanding ‘local knowledges’ in tourism development¹⁵⁷⁷, I subsequently became highly critical towards the concept of local knowledge as such. The scholarly literature of development studies has helped me to grasp the ethno- and Eurocentrism of this concept¹⁵⁷⁸; indeed, it is curious that it is a concept that is considered applicable mainly in peripheral areas, most likely overseas. At least I have difficulty imagining that someone might study local knowledges of a family living, let’s say, in the suburbs of Stockholm. In short, I encourage caution when it comes to offering a focus on local knowledges as a solution to community-based tourism initiatives.

Although I have conducted a longitudinal study in the communities of San Ramón, it is difficult to think of the opposite scenario, where a researcher from Nicaragua would collect data on the things that are happening in my life.¹⁵⁷⁹ I acknowledge the naiveté of this comment, but consider that in order to decolonize tourism epistemologies we cannot accept entrenched relations between those who research and those who always find themselves in the role of the object of research. My sincere hope is that in the future there will be more Nicaraguan and Central American tourism researchers who will challenge and enrich the ways in which we know about tourism today.¹⁵⁸⁰ To complicate things, it is worth noticing that researchers from the so called Global South can strengthen the Western-centric ideas of tourism, development and participation.¹⁵⁸¹ In fact, as my case study in San

1577 Nordic Tourism Conference, Rovaniemi 2011.

1578 See e.g. Nygren 1999; Briggs & Sharp 2004.

1579 I am grateful to Liina-Maija Quist for encouraging me to envision this kind of scenario.

1580 For general remarks about research in social sciences in Nicaragua, see Pakkasvirta & Quesada 2007, 16-26.

1581 Tourism researchers Chambers and Buzinde have recently offered some insightful analysis on the topic

Ramón has shown, the students from the local University of Matagalpa were visiting rural tourism communities with attitudes at least partly similar to those exhibited by their international colleagues. They expected every bit as much that the members of the local communities would be delighted to participate in their studies and considered that they should help the families to organize their lives for tourism development in the process. In sum, as Higgins-Desbiolles and Powes Whyte¹⁵⁸² have argued, we researchers should pay more attention to the issue of privilege when studying and supporting marginalized communities.

Accordingly, the last time I travelled home from Nicaragua I thought about the virtue of ‘being welcomed to return’. I also looked forward to meeting my family and to making plans to welcome our friends to drink the Nicaraguan coffee that I had just received as a gift. Although I was facing difficulties appreciating some of the contemporary aspects of the global tourism industries and academic research, I knew that it had been the ideas of tourism and research that had brought me to these communities and given me the possibility to meet ‘the faces behind the coffee cup’. It had been these encounters in particular that had made me realize that hospitality and ethics form the fundamental basis of being together with the other. Or, as one of the local hosts in San Ramón put it: ‘I want hospitality to be a concept of humanity – to be a human’.

1582 Higgins-Desbiolles and Powes Whyte 2013; see also Chambers & Buzinde 2015.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ablett, P.G. and Dyer, P.K. (2009) 'Heritage and hermeneutics: towards a broader interpretation of interpretation' *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12:3, 209-233.
- Adler, J. (1989) 'Origins of Sightseeing', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16:1, 7-29.
- Agamben, G. (1990/2007) *The Coming Community*, translated by M. Hardt. Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2000) *Strange Encounters. Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London: Routledge.
- Ahmed, S. (2007) *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Aho, S. and Ilola, H. (2004) *Maaseudun Elinvoimaisuus – Nykyisyydestä ainekcia tulevaisuuteen*. Lapin yliopiston kauppatieteiden ja matkailun julkaisuja B1. Rovaniemi.
- Aithcinson, C. (2001) 'Theorizing Other discourses of tourism, gender and culture. Can the subaltern speak in (tourism)?'. *Tourism Studies*, 1:2, 133-147.
- Ankor, Jo (2009) *Pleasure and Dread: The Paradox of Travel*. University of Technology, Sydney.
- Arai, S. (1996) 'Benefits of citizen participation in a healthy communities initiative: Linking community development and empowerment'. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 21, 25-44
- Arnstein, S. (1969) 'A Ladder Of Citizen Participation'. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35:4, 216-224.
- Ateljevic, J. and Page, S. (eds) (2009) *Tourism and Entrepreneurship. International Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Loftland, J. and Lofland, L. (2001) 'Editorial Introduction', in P. Atkinson et al. (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage Publications, pp.1-8.
- Atterton, P. and Calarcos, M. (2010) 'The Third Wave of Levinas' scholarship', in P. Atterton and M. Calarcos (eds) *Radicalizing Levinas*. New York: SUNY Press, pp. ix-xvii.
- Ayikoru, M. (2009) 'Epistemology, Ontology and Tourism', in Tribe, John (ed.), *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 62-79.
- Ayikoru, M., Tribe, J., Airey D. (2009) 'Reading Tourism Education: Neoliberalism Unveiled', in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36:2, 191-221.
- Baker, G. (2010) The 'Double Law' of Hospitality: Rethinking Cosmopolitan Ethics in Humanitarian Intervention. *International Relations*, 24:1, 87-103.

- Baker, G. (2011) *Politicising Ethics in International Relations: Cosmopolitanism as Hospitality*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, G. (2013) 'Introduction', in G. Baker (ed.) *Hospitality and World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-20.
- Barnett, T. (2008) 'Tourism a tool for more humanized world?', in D'Mello, Cesar ed. *Transforming Re-forming Tourism, Perspectives on Justice and Humanity in Tourism*. Ecumenial Coalition on Tourism, Thailand.
- Barrera, O.D. (1997) *El sector turístico en Nicaragua: Actualidad y posibilidades de desarrollo. Un enfoque estratégico*. Managua: UCA.
- Barrera, O.D. (1998) 'Turismo y Globalización: un reto para Nicaragua'. *Encuentro* 48, 46-53.
- Baumgartner M., Karanth, G.K., Aurora, G.S. and Ramaswamy, V. (2004) 'In dialogue with indigenous knowledge: sharing research to promote empowerment of rural communities in India', in A. Bicker, P. Sillitoe and J. Pottier (eds), *Investigating local knowledge*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Becker, H.S. (1998) *Tricks of the Trade: How to think about your research while you're doing it*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Belhassen, Y. and Caton, K. (2011) On the need for critical pedagogy in tourism education. *Tourism Management*, 32:6, 1389-1396.
- Bell, D. (2009) 'Tourism and Hospitality', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 19– 34.
- Belli, G. (2002) *The Country Under My Skin. A Memoir of Love and War*. Knopf Borzot Books.
- Belsky, J.M. (2004) 'Contributions of qualitative research to understanding the politics of community ecotourism', in J. Phillimore and L. Goodson (eds), *Qualitative Methods in Tourism Research*. London: Routledge Press, pp. 273-291.
- Bennett, T. and Joyce, P. (eds) (2010) *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*. London: Routledge.
- Benveniste, É. (1973) *Indo-European Language and Society*, translated by E. Palmer. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Bergeã, J. (2002) *Class Travellers in Chicken Buses, Backpacking, Economic Inequality and Cultural Identity in Guatemala*. Minor Field Study, Gothenburg University, Peace and Development Research Institute. <http://folkbildning.net/contentassets/a11c279ec08c4224a5ea3630f61f9c4e/class-travellers.pdf>
- Berkhöfer, U. and Berkhöfer, A. (2007) 'Participation' in Development Thinking – Coming to Grips with a Truism and its Critiques', in S. Stoll-Kleemann and M. Welp (eds), *Stakeholder dialogues in Natural Resource Management: Theory and practice*. London: Spinger, pp. 79-116.
- Berking, H. (1999) *Sociology of Giving*, translated by P. Camiller. London: Sage.
- Berno, T. (1999) 'When is a guest a guest? Cook Islanders conceptualize tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26:3, 565-675.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

- Bianchi, R.V. (1999) *A critical ethnography of tourism entrepreneurship and social change in a fishing community in Gran Canaria*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of North London.
- Bianchi, R.V. (2014) 'Towards a New Political Economy of Global Tourism Revisited', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds) *Tourism and Development. Concepts and Issues, 2nd Edition*. London: Channel View, pp. 287-331.
- Blackstock, K. (2005) 'A Critical Look at Community Cased Tourism', *Community Development Journal* 40:1, 39-49.
- Blazer, M. (2010) *Storytelling Globalization from the Chaco and Beyond*, London: Duke University Press.
- Blázquez, M. and Cañada, E. (2011) *Turismo Placebo. Nueva colonización turística: del Mediterráneo a Mesoamérica y El Caribe. Lógicas espaciales del capital turístico*. Magnagua: Editorial Enlace.
- Bonilla, A. and Mordt, M. (2008) 'Turismo y conflictos territoriales en el pacífico de Nicaragua: El caso de Tola, más allá de los titulares', *Prisma*. San Salvador.
- Bonilla, A. and Mordt, M. (2011) 'Turismo en el Municipio de Tola (Nicaragua): exclusión y resistencia local'. *AlbaSud*, Opiniones en Desarrollo, Programa Turismo Responsable, Artículo 11.
- Bonney, N.D. (2012) *The Risk of Hospitality: Selfhood, Otherness, and Ethics in Deconstruction and Phenomenological Hermeneutics*, Master's thesis, Institute for Christian Studies.
- Botterill, D. (2001) 'The Epistemology of a Set of Tourism Studies', *Leisure Studies*, 20:3, 199-214.
- Brandth, B. and Haugen M.S. (2014) 'Embodying the rural idyll in farm tourist hosting', *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. 14:2, 101-115.
- Briedenhann, J. and Ramchander, P. (2006) 'Township Tourism – Blessing or Blight? The Case of Soweto in South Africa' in M.K. Smith, M. Robinson (eds), *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World, Politics, Participation and (re)presentation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Briggs, J. and Sharp, J. (2004) 'Indigenous Knowledges and Development: A Postcolonial Caution', *Third World Quarterly*, 2:4, 661– 676.
- Buades, J. (2009) *Do not disturb Barceló. Viaje a las entrañas de un imperio turístico*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Buades, J., Cañada, E. and Gascón, J. (2012) *El turismo en el inicio del milenio: una lectura crítica a tres voces*. Madrid: Imprenta Romeu.
- Burney, J.A. (2007) *The Impacts of Tourism and Development in Nicaragua: A Grassroots Approach to Sustainable Development*. Masters Theses, Paper 70.
- Burns, P. (2004) 'Tourism Planning a Third Way?', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31:1, 24-43.
- Büscher, M., Urry, J. and Witchger, K. eds (2011) *Mobile Methods*. London: Routledge.
- Butcher, J. (2007) *Ecotourism, NGOs and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Butcher, J. (2009) 'Against Ethical Tourism', in J. Tribe (ed.) *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 224-260.

- Butcher, J. (2012) 'The Mantra of 'Community participation' in Context', in T. V. Singh (ed.) *Critical Debates in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Butcher, J., Weaver, D. and Singh, S. (2012) 'Concluding Remarks. Does Community Participation Empower Local People?', in T.V. Singh (ed.) *Critical Debates in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 118-119.
- Butler, R. and Hinch, T. (eds) (1996) *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples*. London: International Thompson Business Press.
- Caffyn, A. (2013) 'Advocating and Implementing Slow Tourism', in T.V. Singh, (ed.) *Critical Debates in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp.373-379.
- Cañada, E. (2010) 'Perspectivas del Turismo Comunitario: Cómo Mantener Vivas las Comunidades Rurales', <http://blog.pucp.edu.pe/item/93900/mundo-perspectivas-del-turismo-comunitario-como-mantener-vivas-las-comunidades-rurales>.
- Cañada, E. (2012) *El turismo en la Soberanía Alimentaria*. <http://www.albasud.org/blog/es/284/el-turismo-en-la-soberania-alimentaria>
- Cañada, E. and Gascón, J. (2007a) *El turismo y sus mitos*. Managua: Fundación Luciernaga.
- Cañada, E. and Gascón, J. (2007b) *Turismo y Desarrollo. Herramientas para una mirada crítica*. Managua: Fundación Luciernaga.
- Cañada, E. and Merodio, I. (2004) *Turismo rural comunitario en Nicaragua: La experiencia de la Unión de Cooperativas Agropecuarias "Tierra y Agua"*. Barcelona, Bilbao.
- Cañada, E., Delgado, L. and Gil, H. (2006) *Guía Turismo Rural Comunitario – Nicaragua*. Managua: Edisa.
- Carlisle, S. (2010) 'Access and Marginalization in Beach Enclave Resort', in S. Cole, N. Morgan (eds), *Tourism and Inequality - Problems and Prospects*. London: CABI Publishing.
- Castaneda, Q. (2006) 'The Invisible Theatre of Ethnography: Performative Principles of Fieldwork', *Anthropological Quarterly*, 79:1, 75-104.
- Caton, K. (2008) *Encountering the Other through study abroad*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Caton, K. (2012) 'Taking the Moral Turn in Tourism Studies', in *Annals of Tourism Research* 39:4, 1906-1928.
- Caton, K. (2013) 'The risky business of understanding: philosophical hermeneutics and the knowing subject in worldmaking', *Tourism Analysis*, 18:3, 341-351
- Caton, K. (2014a) 'Humanism and Tourism: A Moral Encounter', in M. Mostafanezhad and K. Hannam (eds), *Moral Encounters in Tourism*. Surrey: Ashgate, pp. 185-198.
- Caton, K. (2014b) 'Between You and Me: Making Messes with Constructivism and Critical Theory', *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, 13:2, 127-137.
- Caton, K. and Santos, C. A. (2008) 'Closing the Hermeneutic Circle? Photographic Encounters with the Other', *Annals of Tourism Research* 35:1, 7-26.
- Caton, K., and Santos, C. A. (2009) 'Images of the other: Selling study abroad in a postcolonial world', *Journal of Travel Research*, 48:2, 191-204.
- Cernea, M.M. (ed.) (1992) *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cerwonka, A. and Malkki, L.H. (2007) *Improvising Theory. Process and Temporality in Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chalip, L. and Costa, C. A. (2012) 'Clashing Worldviews: Sources of Disappointment in Rural Hospitality and Tourism Development', *Hospitality & Society*, 2:1, 25–47.
- Chambers, D. and Buzinde, C. (2015) 'Tourism and decolonisation: Locating research and self', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 51, 1–16.
- Chambers, R. (1983) *Rural Development, Putting the Last First*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Chandler, D. (2013) 'Where is the Human in Human-Centered Approaches to Development? A Critique of Amartya Sen's 'Development as Freedom'', in S. Mezzadra, J. Reid and S. Ranabhir (eds), *The Biopolitics of Development: Reading Michel Foucault in the Postcolonial Present*. London: Springer, pp. 67–96.
- Cheong, S. and Miller, M. (2000) 'Power and Tourism: A Foucauldian observation'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27:2, 371–390.
- Clifford, J. and Marcus, E. George (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, E. (1979a) 'A Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences', *Sociology* 13:2, 179–201.
- Cohen, E. (1979b) 'The Impact of Tourism on the Hill Tribes of Northern Thailand', *International Asian Forum*, 10:1/2, 5–38.
- Cohen, J.M. and Uphoff, N.T. (2011) 'Participation's place in rural development: Seeking clarity through specificity', in A. Cornwall (ed.) *The Participation Reader*, New York: Zed Books Reader.
- Cohen, R.A. (1987) 'Foreword', in E. Levinas *Time and the Other and Additional Essays*, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Cohen, R.A. (1998) 'Foreword', in E. Levinas 'Otherwise than Being, or Beyond Essence'. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Cole, S and Eriksson, J. (2010) 'Tourism and Human Rights', in S. Cole and N. Morgan (eds) *Tourism and Inequality – Problems and Prospects*. London: CABI Publishing.
- Cole, S. (2006) 'Cultural Tourism, community Participation and Empowerment', in M.K. Smith and M. Robinson (eds) *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World, Politics, Participation and (re)presentation*. London: Channel View Publications.
- Cole, S. (2008) *Tourism, Culture and Development: Hopes, Dreams and Realities in East Indonesia*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Cole, S. and Morgan, N. (2010) 'Introduction', in S. Cole and N. Morgan (eds) *Tourism and Inequality – Problems and Prospects*. London: CABI Publishing.
- Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (2001) 'The Case for Participation as Tyranny', in B. Cooke and U. Kothari (eds) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books, pp. 1–15.
- Cornwall, A. (2000) *Beneficiary, Consumer, Citizen: Perspectives on Participation for Poverty Reduction*. Sida Studies 2, Sida, Stockholm.
- Cornwall, A. (2006) Historical perspectives on participation in development, *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 44:1, 27–43.

- Cornwall, A. (2011) 'Preface', in Andrea Cornwall (ed.) *The Participation Reader*. New York: Zed Books Reader.
- Cornwall, A. and Brock, K. (2005) *Beyond Buzzwords "Poverty Reduction", "Participation" and "Empowerment" in Development Policy*. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development UNRISD.
- Cornwall, A. and Eade, D. (2010) *Deconstructing development discourse. Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*. Oxford: Oxfam GB.
- Correa Oquel, C. (2006) *The Nicaraguans, Los Nicaragüenses*. Colombia, S.A.: Imprelibros.
- Critchley, S. (1999) *The Ethics of Deconstruction. Derrida and Levinas*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Crossley, N. (1996) *Intersubjectivity: The Fabric of Social Becoming*, London: Sage Publications.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975) *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*, New York: Harper Perennial.
- D'Mello, C. ed. (2008) *Transforming Re-forming Tourism, Perspectives on Justice and Humanity in Tourism. Ecumenial Coalition on Tourism*. Thailand: ECOT.
- Dahles, H. and Keune, L. (2002) 'Introduction', in H. Dahles and L. Keune (eds), *Tourism Development and Local Participation in Latin America*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation, pp. 1-11.
- Darcy, S. (2006) 'Setting a Research Agenda for Accessible Tourism', in C. Cooper, T.D. Lacy and L. Jago (eds) *STCRC Technical Report Series*.
- de Kadt, E. (1979) *Tourism, Passport to Development?* Unesco and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Sardan O. (2005) *Anthpology and Development: Understanding Contemporary Social Change*. London; Zed Books.
- de Vylder, S. (2006) *Utvecklingens Drivkrafter, om fattigdom, rikedom och rättvisa i världen*. Värnamo: Fälth and Hässler.
- Denzin, N.K. (2001) *Interpretive Interactionism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S. and Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (2008) 'Introduction', in N. Denzin, Y.S. Lincoln and L. Tuhiwai-Smith (eds) *Book of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- Derrida, J. (1967/1978) *Writing and Difference*, translated by A. Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*, translated by G.C. Spivak. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Derrida, J. (1995) *The gift of death*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1999) *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, translated P.A. Brault and M. Naas, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2000) *Of Hospitality. Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond*, translated by R. Bowlby. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2003) *Sur Parole: Instantanés Philosophiques*. Paris: Editions de l'aube.
- Derrida, J. (2005) 'The Principle of Hospitality', *Parallax*, 11.1, 6-9.

- Derrida, J. and Rottenberg, E. (2002) *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews, 1971–2001*. Stanford C.A.: Stanford University Press.
- Dicks, B. (2003) *Culture on Display: The Production of Contemporary Visitability*. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill.
- Dielemans, J. (2008) *Välkommen till Paradiset. Reportage om Turismindustrin* [Welcome to Paradise]. Bokförlaget Atlas/GGB Media, Germany.
- Dixey, L. (2008) 'The unsustainability of community tourism donor projects: Lessons from Zambia', in A. Spenceley (ed.) *Responsible Tourism: Critical Issues for Conservation and Development*. London: Earthscan, pp. 323–40.
- Dowling, R.K. (2003) 'Community Attitudes: Tourism Development in Natural Environments', T. Singh, J.T. Dallen, & R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 205–228.
- Drabinski, J.E. (2011) *Levinas and the Postcolonial. Race, Nation, Other*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Drabinski, J.E. and Nelson, E. S. (eds) (2014) *Between Levinas and Heidegger*. Albany: Suny Press.
- Dredge, D. (2010) 'Place change and tourism development conflict: evaluating public interest', *Tourism Management*, 31:1, 104–112.
- Dredge, D. (2011) 'Phronetic Tourism Planning Research: reflections on critically engaged tourism planning research and practice', IV Critical Tourism Studies Conference: Tourism Futures: Creative and Critical Action, Cardiff: Welsh Centre for Tourism Research.
- Dredge, D. and Hales, R. (2012) 'Community Case Study Research', in L. Dwyer, A. Gill and N. Seetaram (eds), *Research Methods in Tourism: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Cheltenham MA: Edward Elgar, pp. 417– 437.
- Dredge, D., Hales, R. and Jamal, T. (2013) 'Community case study research: Researcher operacy, embeddedness and making research matter', *Tourism Analysis*, 18:1, 29–43.
- Dussel, E. (2013) *Ethics of Liberation: In the Age of Globalization and Exclusion*. Durham NC: Dukes University Press.
- Dussel, E. (2008) *Twenty Theses on Politics*, translated by G. Ciccariello-Maher. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Easterly, W. (2006) *The White Man's Burden. Why the west's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Echtner C. and Prasad P. (2003) The Context of Third World Tourism Marketing, in *Annals of Tourism Research* 30:3, 660–82.
- Edelheim, J. (2007) *The Bushranger and the Big Banana: A Cultural Studies Critique of Tourism Studies*. PhD thesis, Department of Critical and Cultural Studies, Macquarie University, NSW, Australia.
- Edelheim, J. (2013) Vieraanvaraisuus – mitä se todellisuudessa on? Multidimensional Tourism Institute, Newsletter (June 19 2013) <http://matkailu.luc.fi/news/Johan-Edelheim-Vieraanvaraisuus-%E2%80%93-mita-se-todellisuudessa-on/kcmpiru3/565dbc1c-d64b-40fc-a2d1-ebc39a79244e>.

- Edelheim, J. (2015) *Tourist Attractions: From Objective to Narrative*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Edensor, T. (1998) *Tourists at the Taj: Performance and meaning at a symbolic site*. London: Routledge.
- Edensor, T. (2009) 'Tourism and Performance', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Eksell, J. (2013) 'Värdeskapande Gästfrihet. Hur gästfrihet som värde ramas in, etableras och förhandlas i hotellbranschen' [Valuecreating Hospitality]. Lund: Media-Tryck.
- Equipo Nitlapan - Envió (2008) 'Hasta cuándo?', *Envío, Revista Mensual de la Universidad Centroamericana (UCA)*. Managua, Nicaragua, Num. 318, 3-12.
- Equipo Nitlapan - Envió (2008) 'Las Reglas del Juego'. *Envío, Revista Mensual de la Universidad Centroamericana (UCA)*, Managua, Nicaragua, Numero 319, 3-13.
- Eriksson Baaz, M. (2005) *The Paternalism of Partnership. A Postcolonial Reading of Identity in Development Aid*, London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Escobar, A. (2010) 'Latin America at a Crossroads', *Cultural Studies*, 24.1, 1-65.
- Escobar, A. (2012) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.
- Fagence, M. (2003) 'Tourism and Local Society and Culture', T. Singh, J.T. Dallen, & R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 55-78.
- Fennell, D. (2006) *Tourism Ethics*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Fennell, D. (2008) 'Responsible Tourism: A Kierkegaardian Interpretation', *Tourism Recreation Research*, 33:1, 3-12.
- Fennell, D. (2009) 'Ethics and tourism', in J. Tribe (ed.) *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 211-226.
- Fennell, D. and Przeclawski, K. (2003) 'Generating Goodwill in Tourism', in T. Singh, J.T. Dallen, & R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 135-152.
- Fetterman, D.M. (1998) *Ethnography: Step by Step* (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Fleischer, A. and Felsentein, D. (2000) 'Support for Rural Tourism. Does it make Difference?', in *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27:4, 1007-1027.
- Freire, P. (1970/2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998) *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Friberg, M. (1999) 'Schumpeter's principle-cultural continuity in a changing world', in Schulz, M. *Peace and development: Their interrelationship in the Global System*, Padrigu Papers Series, University of Gothenburg.
- Gadamer, H.G. (1975) *Truth and Method*, translation revised by J. Weinsheimer and G.M. Donald. New York: Seabury Press.
- Ganem-Cuenca, A. (2011) *Gender Equity and Health within Fair Trade Certified Coffee Cooperatives in Nicaragua: Tensions and Challenges*. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

- García-Rosell, J-C (2013) *A Multi-Stakeholder Perspective on Sustainable Marketing: Promoting Sustainability through Action and Research*. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Geleta, E.B. (2015) *The Microfinance Mirage: The Politics of Poverty, Social Capital and Women's Empowerment in Ethiopia*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- George, E.W, Mair H. and Reid, D.G. (2009) *Rural Tourism Development Localism and Cultural Change*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Germann Molz, J. (2007) Cosmopolitans in the Couch: Mobile Hospitality and the Internet, in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds) *Mobilizing Hospitality, The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 65-82.
- Germann Molz, J. (2011) 'Connectivity, collaboration, search', in M. Büscher, J. Urry and K. Witchger (eds) *Mobile Methods*. London: Routledge.
- Germann Molz, J. (2014) 'Camping in Clearing', in S. Veijola, J. Germann Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert and A. Grit, *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 19-41.
- Germann Molz, J. and Gibson, S. (2007) Introduction: Mobilizing and Mooring Hospitality, in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson(eds) *Mobilizing Hospitality, The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 1-26.
- Gmelch, G. (2003) *Behind the Smile: The Working lives on Caribbean Tourism*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, H. (2011) *Taking Responsibility for Tourism: Responsible Tourism Management*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.
- Goodwin, H. and Boekhold, H. (2010) 'Beyond Fair Trade: Enhancing the Livelihoods of Coffee Farmers in Tanzania', in L. Jolliffe (ed.) *Coffee Culture, Destinations and Tourism*. London: Channel View Publications.
- Goodwin, H., Santilli, R. and Armstrong, R. (2014) 'Community-based tourism in the developing world: delivering the goods?', *Progress in Responsible Tourism*, 3:1, 31-56.
- Gotman, A. (2001) *Le Sens de l'hospitalité: Essai sur les fondements sociaux de l'accueil classique*, Paris: Seuil.
- Gould, J. and Secher Marcussen, H. eds (2004) *Ethnographies of Aid: Exploring Development Texts and Encounters*. Roskilde: Roskilde University.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publisher.
- Greig, A., Hulme, D. and Turner, M. (2007) *Challenging Global Inequality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grimwood, B. S. R., and Doubleday, N. C. (2013) Illuminating traces: Enactments of responsibility in practices of Arctic river tourists and inhabitants, *Journal of Eco-tourism*, 12:2, 53-74.
- Grit A. and Lynch, P. (2013) 'Moving towards Hospity', unpublished paper.
- Grit, A. (2010) 'The Opening up of Hospitality Spaces to Difference: Exploring the Nature of Home Exchange Experiences', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Strathclyde.

- Grit, A. (2014) 'Messing Around with Serendipities', in S. Veijola, J. Germann Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert and A. Grit, *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalitys*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 122-142.
- Grit, A. and Lynch, P. (2012) 'An Analysis of the Development of Home Exchange Organisations', *Research in Hospitality Management*, 1:1, 1-7.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2008) 'Developmentalism, Modernity, and Dependency Theory in Latin America', in M. Moraña, E. Dussel, and C.A. Jáuregui (eds) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 307-355.
- Grosz, E. (1995) 'Women, chora, dwelling', in S. Watson and K. Gibson (eds) *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publisher.
- Haanpää, M., Hakkarainen, M and Garcia-Rosell, J-C (2014) Etnografia kehittämisen välineenä. In P. Hämeenaho and E. Koskinen-Koivisto (eds), *Moniulotteinen etnografia.a*. Tallinna, Tallinnan Kirjapaino, pp. 287-307.
- Hakkarainen M. (2009) 'Matkailu maaseudun uutena työnä' [Tourism as new work in rural areas], in S. Tuulentie (ed.) *Turisti tulee kylään. Matkailukeskukset ja lappilainen arki* [Tourist comes to visit]. Helsinki: Minerva Kustannus Oy, pp. 86-108.
- Hakkarainen, M. (2011) 'Nykypäivän Lokka ja Syrjäkylän mahdollisuudet' [Opportunities in a peripheral village], in L. Pyhäjärvi, M. Hakkarainen, T. Helle, S. Tuulentie, M. Autti and P- Sarala (eds) *Lokka muutosten näyttämönä*. Rovaniemi: Acta Lapponica Fenniae.
- Hakkarainen, M. (forthcoming) *Matkailutoimintaa kylän ehdoilla* [Tourism in terms of the local village]. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Hall, M. C. (2007) 'North-South Perspectives on Tourism, Regional Development and Peripheral Areas', in D.K. Müller and B. Jansson (eds), *The Difficult Business of Making Pleasure Peripheries Prosperous: Perspectives on Space, Place and Environment*. Oxfordshire: CABI, 19-37.
- Hall, M. C. and Tucker, H. (2004) *Tourism and Postcolonialism: Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, M.C. (1994) *Tourism and Politics. Policy, Power and Place*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Hall, M.C. (2003) 'Politics and Place: An analysis of Power in Tourism communities', T. Singh, J.T. Dallen, & R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 99-114.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. Third Edition. London: Routledge.
- Hand, S. (2009) *Emmanuel Levinas*. Routledge Critical Thinkers. London: Routledge.
- Harding, S. ed. (1987) *Feminism and Methodology, Social Science Issues*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harvey, B. and Kelsay, D. (2010) 'La Ruta del Café and Los Santos Coffee Tourism: A Central America Project to Develop Coffee-Related tourism to Augment Coffee Families' Incomes', in L. Jolliffe (ed.) *Coffee, Culture, Destinations and Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

- Hashimoto, A (2014) 'Tourism and Socio-cultural Development Issues', in R. Sharpley and D.J. Telfer (eds) *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues*, 2nd Edition. Bristol: Channel View Publication, pp. 205-236.
- Hatton, M.J. (1999) *Community-based Tourism in the Asia-Pacific*. Toronto: School of Media Studies.
- Hautamäki, A., Lehtonen, T., Sihvola J., Tuomi, I., Vaaranen, H. and Veijola, S. eds (2005) *Yhteisöllisyyden paluu* [The Return of Communitality]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Heidegger, M. (1927/1972) *Being and Time*, translated by J. Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Heinämaa, S. and Oksala, J. (2011) *Rakkaudesta toiseen: kirjoituksia vuosituhannen vaihteen etiikasta*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus Kirja.
- Heldt Cassel, S. and Pettersson, K. (2015) 'Performing Gender and Rurality in Swedish Farm Tourism', *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 15:1-2, 138-151.
- Henkel, H. and Roderick, S. (2001) 'Participation as Spiritual Duty; Empowerment as Secular Subjection', in B. Cooke and U. Kothari (eds) *Participation: the New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Hergenrather, K.D., Rhodes, S.G., Bardhoshi, G. (2010) 'Photovoice as Community-based Participatory Research: A Qualitative Review', *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 33:6, 686-698.
- Hettne, B. (2009) *Thinking about Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. eds (2004) *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* New York: Zed Books.
- Hiddleston, J. (2009) *Understanding Postcolonialism*. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Hietalahti, J. and Nygren A. (2014) 'Microcredit as a socio-political institution in South Africa. The complexity of rules, logic and power relations', in F. Hossain, C. Rees and T. Knight-Millar (eds) *Microcredit and International Development Contexts, Achievements and Challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006) 'More Than an "Industry": The Forgotten Power of Tourism as a Social Force', *Tourism Management*, 27, 1192-1208.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008), 'Justice tourism and alternative globalisation', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16:3, 345-364.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. and Powys Whyte, K. (2013) 'No high hopes for hopeful tourism: A critical comment', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40:1, 428-433.
- Höckert, E. (2009) *Sociocultural Sustainability of Rural Community-based Tourism. Case Study of Local Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Trail, Nicaragua*. Master thesis, University of Lapland.
- Höckert, E. (2011) Community-based Tourism in Nicaragua: A Socio-Cultural Perspective., *The Finnish Journal of Tourism Research*, 7:2, 7-25.
- Höckert, E. (2014) 'Unlearning through Hospitality', in S. Veijola, J. Germann Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert and A. Grit, *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitality*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 96-121.

- Höckert, E., Hakkarainen, M. and Jänis, J. (2013) 'Matkailun paikallinen kehittäminen maaseudulla', in S. Veijola, (ed.), *Matkailututkimuksen lukukirja*. Rovaniemi: Lapin Yliopistokustannus, pp. 160-172.
- Hollinshead, K. (1998) 'Tourism, hybridity, and Ambiguity: The relevance of Bhabha's 'Third Space' Cultures', *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30:1, 121-156.
- Hollinshead, K. (2002) 'Playing with the Past: Heritage Tourism Under the Tyrannies of Postmodern Discourse', in C. Ryan (ed.), *The Tourist Experience*. London: Continuum, pp. 172– 200.
- Hollinshead, K. (2004) 'Tourism and new sense; Worldmaking and the enunciative value of tourism', in C.M. Hall and H. Tucker (eds) *Tourism and Postcolonialism: Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations*, Routledge, London, UK.
- Hollinshead, K. and T. Jamal (2007) 'Tourism and "the third ear": further propsects for qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Analysis*, 12, 85–129.
- Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic I. and Ali, N. (2009) 'Worldmaking agency: worldmaking authority. The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 11 (4), 427–43.
- Hossain, F., Rees, C. and Knight-Millar, T. eds(2014) *Microcredit and International Development Contexts, Achievements and CHallenges*. Routledge, London.
- Huijbens, E. and Benediktsson (2013) 'Inspiring the Visitor? Landscapes and Horizons of Hospitality', *Tourist Studies*, 13:2,189-208.
- Hulme, P. (2008) 'Postcolonial Theory and Representation of Culture in Americas', in M. Moraña, E. Dussel, and C.A. Jáuregui (eds) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 388-396.
- Hultman, J. and Andresson Cederholm, E. (2012) 'Bed, Breakfast and Friendship: Intimacy and Distance in Small-Scale Hospitality Businesses'. *Culture Unbound*, 2:3, 365-380.
- Humberstone, B. (2004) 'Standpoint research: Multiple versions of reality in tourism theorising and research', in J. Phillimore and L. Goodson (eds) *Qualitative research in tourism*. London: Routledge Press, pp. 119-136.
- Hylland Eriksen, T. and Sivert Nielsen, F. (2001) *A History of Anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
- Hytten, K. (2004) 'Post-Critical Ethnography: Research as a Pedagogical Encounter', in G.W. Noblit, S. Y., Flores, & E. G. Murillo Jr. (eds), *Postcritical Ethnography: Reinscribing Critique*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, pp. 95-105.
- Inayatullah, S. (1995) 'Rethinking tourism: unfamiliar histories and alternative futures', *Tourism Management*. 16:6, 411-415.
- INTUR (2006) Instituto Nicaragüense de Turismo Nicaragua: Boletín de Estadísticas de Turismo 2006.
- INTUR (2009a) Definición de la Política y Estrategias para el Turismo Rural Sostenible de Nicaragua. Managua: Instituto Nicaragüense de Turismo.
- INTUR (2009b) Boletín de Estadísticas de Turismo Nicaragua No 20, Año 2009. Managua, Nicaragua.

- INTUR (2010a) Instituto Nicaraguense de Turismo, Informe de Logros. Managua, Nicaragua.
- INTUR (2010b) Política y Estrategia de Turismo Rural Sostenible. Fincas Agroturisticas de Nicaragua. Managua, Nicaragua.
- INTUR (2011a) Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Turístico Sostenible de Nicaragua. Estrategia de Desarrollo 2011-2020. Managua, Nicaragua.
- INTUR (2011b) Plan Nacional De Desarrollo Turístico Sostenible de Nicaragua. Estrategia de Marketing 2011-2020. Managua, Nicaragua.
- INTUR (2012a) Plan de Negocios. Fincas Agroturisticas, Nicaragua. Managua, Nicaragua.
- INTUR (2012b) Política y Estrategia de Turismo Rural Sostenible. Turismo Rural Sostenible y sus beneficiarios.
- INTUR (2013) Boletín de Estadísticas de Turismo de Nicaragua No. 24 Año 2013. Managua, Nicaragua.
- Irigaray, L. (1994/2000) *Democracy Begins between Two*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Jamal, T. (2004) 'Virtue ethics and sustainable tourism pedagogy: phronesis, principles and practice', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12:6, 530-545.
- Jamal, T. and Camargo, B. (2013) 'Sustainable Tourism, Justice and an Ethic of Care: towards the Just Destination', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22:1, 11-30.
- Jamal, T. and Dredge, D. (2014) 'Tourism and Community Development Issues', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer, *Tourism and Development. Concepts and Issues, Second Edition*. London: Channel View, pp. 178-204.
- Jamal, T. and Everett, J. (2007) 'Rationalization in the Natural and Academic Life-World: Critical Research or Hermeneutic Charity?', in I. Ateljevic, N. Morgan and A. Pritchard (eds), *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methodologies*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 57-76.
- Jamal, T. and Getz, D. (1995) 'Collaboration theory and community tourism planning', *Annals of Tourism Research* 22:1, 186-204.
- Jamal, T. and Hill, S. (2002) 'The Home and the World: (Post)touristic Spaces if (In) authenticity?', in D. Graham (ed.), *The Tourist as a Metaphor of the Social World*. London: CABI.
- Jamal, T. and Hollinshead, K. (2001) 'Tourism and the forbidden zone: the underserved power of qualitative inquiry', *Tourism Management*, 22:1, 63-82.
- Jamal, T. and Menzel C. (2009) 'Good actions in tourism', in J. Tribe (ed.), *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 227-243.
- Jamal, T. and Stronza, A. (2008) 'Dwelling" with ecotourism in the Peruvian Amazon: Cultural relationships in local-global spaces', *Tourist Studies*, 8:3, 313-336.
- Jamal, T., Budke, C.M. and Barradas-Bribiesca, I. (2014) 'Health and Sustainable Development: New Directions Forward', in H. Balslev Clausen, S. Gyimóthy and V. Andersson (eds) *Global Mobilities and Tourism Development; A Community Perspective*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

- Jamal, T., Everett, J. and Dann, G. (2003) 'Ecological rationalization and performative resistance in natural area destinations', in *Tourist Studies*, 3:2, 143-169.
- Jänis, J. (2011) *The Tourism-Development Nexus in Namibia – A study of National Tourism Policy and Local Tourism Enterprises' Policy Knowledge*. Helsinki: Interkont Books.
- Jänis, J. and Timonen, O. (2014) 'Encounters in Volunteer Tourism: A case Study from Zambia', in H. Balslev Clausen, S. Gyimóthy and V. Andersson (eds), *Global Mobilities and Tourism Development; A Community Perspective*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.
- Jennings, G., R. (2009) 'Methodologies and Methods', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 673-693.
- Jirón, P. (2011) On Becoming 'la sombra/the shadow', in M. Büscher, J. Urry and K. Witchger (eds), *Mobile Methods*. London: Routledge, pp. 36-63.
- Johnston, A. M. (2006) *Is the Sacred for Sale? Tourism and Indigenous Peoples*. Earthscan, London.
- Jokinen, E and Veijola, S. (1997) 'The Disoriented Tourist. The Figuration of the Tourist in Contemporary Cultural Critique', in C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds), *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, London and New York: Routledge, 23– 51.
- Jokinen, E. and Veijola, S. (2003) 'Mountains and Landscapes: Towards Embodied Visualities', in D. Crouch and N. Lübbren (eds), *Visual Culture and Tourism*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 259–279.
- Jokinen, E. and Veijola, S. (2012) 'Time to Hostess: Reflections on Borderless Care', in C. Minca & T. Oakes (eds), *Real Tourism: Practice, Care and Politics in Contemporary Travel Culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 38-53.
- Jolliffe, L. ed. (2010) *Coffee, Culture, Destinations and Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Jordan, S. and Yeomans, D. (1995) 'Critical Ethnography: problems in contemporary theory and practice', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 16:3, 389-408.
- Judén-Tupakka, S. (2007) 'Askelia fenomenologiseen analyysiin. Fenomenologinen menetelmä empiirisessä tutkimuksessa' [Phenomenology in empirical research], in E. Syrjäläinen, A. Eronen and V-M. Värrä (eds) *Avauksia laadullisen tutkimuksen analyysiin* [Qualitative Analysis]. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, pp. 62–90
- Kalisch A. (2010) 'Fair Trade in Tourism: a marketing tool for transformation?', in Cole, S. and Morgan, N. (eds) *Tourism and Inequality*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Kallio-Tavin, M. (2013) *Encountering Self, Other and the Third: Researching the Crossroads of Art Pedagogy, Levinasian Ethics and Disability Studies*. Helsinki: Aalto University.
- Kant, I. (1996 [1775]) *Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Project*, in *Practical Philosophy: The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, translated by M.J. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kapoor, I. (2004) 'Hyper self reflexive development? Spivak on representing the Third World 'Other'', *Third World Quarterly* 25:4, 627-47.
- Kearney, R. and Dooley, M. (1999) *Questioning Ethics*. London: Routledge.

- Keogh, B. (1990) 'Public Participation in community tourism planning', *Annals of Tourism Research* 17, 449-465.
- Kincaid, J. (1988) *A Small Place*, New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux.
- King, B. and Pearlman, M. (2009) 'Planning for Tourism at Local and Regional Levels: Principles, Practices and Possibilities', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 416-431.
- Kinloch Tijerino, F. (2008) *Historia de Nicaragua, 3era Edición*. Managua: IHNCA-UCA.
- Knapman, C. (2011) 'When is a right not a right? Assessing the translation of the international legal guarantees for the right to food to rural Nicaragua through the state programme, *Hambre Cero*'. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Knut, W. (1993) *The Regime of Anastasio Somoza, 1936-1956*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Kontogeorgopoulos, N. (2005) 'Ecotourism and Mass Tourism in Southern Thailand: Spatial Interdependence, Structural Connections, and Staged Authenticity', *Geojournal* 61:1, 1-11.
- Krippendorf, J. (1987) *The Holiday Makers. Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Kuhn, T. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2007) *Reshaping the University. Responsibilities, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Kvale, S. (1996) *InterViews. An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Laachir, K. (2007) 'Hospitality and the Limitations of the National', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds) *Mobilizing Hospitality, The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 177-190.
- Ladyga, Z. (2012) 'Tracing Levinas in Gayatri Spivak's Ethical Representations of Subalternity', in E. B. Luczak, J. Wierzchowska and J. Ziarkowska (eds), *In Other Words. Dialogizing Postcoloniality, Race, and Ethnicity*. Warzawa: Encounters, pp. 221-230.
- Langdrige, D. (2007) *Phenomenological Psychology: Theory, Research and Method*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Lashley, C. (2000) 'Towards a theoretical understanding', in C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds) *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 1-17.
- Laurinkari, J. (2007) *Yhteisötalous: Johdatus perusteisiin*. Helsinki: Palmenia.
- Leal, P. A. (2010) 'Participation: the ascendancy of a buzzword in the neo-liberal era', in A. Cornwall and D. Eade, *Deconstructing development discourse. Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*. Oxford: Oxfam GB.
- Lehtonen, T.-K. (2008) *Aineellinen yhteisö*. Tampere: Juvenes Print.
- Levinas, E. (1969) *Totality and Infinity. An Essay on Exteriority*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

- Levinas, E. (1985) *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*, translated by R.A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1987) *Time and the Other and Additional Essays*, translated by R.A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1990) *Nine Talmudic Readings*, translated by A. Aronowicz. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1998) *Otherwise than Being, or Beyond Essence*, translated by A. Lingis. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Li, T. (2007) *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics*. London: Duke University Press.
- Li, W. (2006) 'Community Decisionmaking. Participation in Development', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33:1, 132-143.
- Lund, C. (2014) 'Of What is This a Case?: Analytical Movements in Qualitative Social Science Research', in *Human organization* 73:3, 224-234.
- Lüthje, M. (2005) *Se mukava maaseutu siellä jossain. Maaseutumatkailu kokemusten, mielikuvien ja markkinoinnin kohteena* [That pleasant countryside somewhere out there: rural tourism as an object of experiences, mental images and marketing]. Rovaniemi: Lapin Yliopistopaino.
- Lykes, M.B. and Coquillon, E. (2007) 'Participatory and Action Research and Feminisms: Towards Transformative Praxis', in S. Hesse-Biber (ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*. Thousand Oaks CA: SAGE, pp. 297-326.
- Lynch, P. A., McIntosh, A. J., and Tucker, H. (2009) *Commercial Homes in Tourism: An International Perspective*, London: Routledge.
- Lynch, P., Di Domenico, M.L. and Sweeney, L. (2007) 'Resident Hosts and Mobile Strangers: Temporary Exchanges within the Topography of the Commercial Home', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds) *Mobilizing Hospitality, The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 121-144.
- Lynch, P., Germann Molz, J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P. and Lashley, C. (2011) 'Theorizing Hospitality', Editorial in *Hospitality & Society*. 1:1, 3-24.
- MacCannell, D. (1976/1999) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Madison, S.D. (2012) *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance* Second Edition. London: SAGE Publications.
- Maguire, P. (2011) 'Doing Feminist Participatory Research', in A. Cornwall (ed.) *The Participation Reader*. New York: Zed Books Reader.
- Maldonado, C. (2005) *Pautas Metodológicas para el análisis de experiencias de turismo comunitario* [Methodologies for analysing experiences of community-base tourism]. SEED Documento de Trabajo núm. 73. Geneva: ILO.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2010) 'On The Coloniality of Being: Contribution to the development of a concept', in W.D. Mignolo and A. Escobar, (eds) *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*. London: Routledge, pp. 94-124.

- Manuel-Navarrete, D., Pelling, M. and Redclift, M. (2010) 'Governance as process: Powerspheres and climate change response', Environment, Politics and Development Working Paper Series, paper # 10, King College London.
- Marcus, G.E. (2014) 'Etnografian uudet haasteet *Writing Culture* –liikkeen jälkeen' [New challenges in Ethnography after the *Writing Culture*], in P. Hämeenaho, E. Koskinen-Koivisto (eds), *Moniulotteinen etnografia* [Multidimensional Ethnography]. Tallinna: Tallinnan kirjapaino.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D. (2010), 'Beyond growth: reaching tourism-led development', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37:4, 1141–1163.
- Mauss, M. (2008/1924) *The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*. London: Routledge.
- McEwan, C. (2009) *Postcolonialism and Development*. London: Routledge.
- McIntyre, A. (2008) *Participatory action research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- McLeod, J. (2010) *Beginning postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- McNaughton, D. (2006) 'The Host as Uninvited Guest: Hospitality, Violence and Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33:3, 645–665.
- McRoberts, D. (2012) 'Building a movement – Solidarity, activism and travel from North America to Nicaragua', Master's thesis, Geography - Tourism Policy and Planning. University of Waterloo, Ontario.
- Mendieta, E. (2008) 'Remapping Latin American Studies: Postcolonialism, Subaltern Studies, Post-Occidentalism, and Globalization Theory', in M. Moraña, E. Dussel, and C.A. Jáuregui (eds) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 286–306.
- Mettiäinen, I., Uusitalo, M. and Rantala, O. (2009) 'Osallisuus matkailukeskusten suunnittelussa' [Participation in tourism planning], in S. Tuulentie (ed.) *Turisti tulee kylään. Matkailukeskukset ja lappilainen arki*. [Tourist comes to visit]. Helsinki: Minerva Kustannus Oy, pp. 207–242.
- Mezzadra, S., Reid, J. and Ranabir, S. (2013) 'Introduction: Reading Foucault in the Postcolonial Present', in S. Mezzadra, J. Reid and S. Ranabir (eds) *The Biopolitics of Development: Reading Michel Foucault in the Postcolonial Present*. London: Springer. 1–14.
- Midgley, J. (2011) 'Community Participation: history, concepts and controversies', in A. Cornwall (ed.) *The Participation Reader*. New York: Zed Books Reader.
- Miettinen, S. (2007) *Designing the Creative Tourism Experience. A Service Design Process with Namibian Crafts People*. Publication series of University of Art and Design Helsinki A 81. Doctoral Dissertation. Jyväskylä: Gummerus kirjapaino Oy.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2005) *The Idea of Latin America*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2008) 'The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference', in M. Moraña, E. Dussel, and C.A. Jáuregui (eds) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 225–258.
- Mignolo, W. D. and Escobar, A. (2010) *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*. London: Routledge.

- Minnaert, L., Maitland, R. and Miller, G. (2011) 'What is social tourism?', *Current issues in Tourism*, 14:5, 403-415.
- Mitchell and Muckosy (2008) *A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America*. ODI Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Mitchell, J. and Ashley, C. (2010) *Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Pathways to Prosperity*. London: Earthscan.
- Mohanty, C.T. (1999) 'Med västerländska ögon. Feministisk forskning och kolonial diskurs', in Eriksson et al. (eds) *Globaliseringens kulturer: Den postkoloniala paradoxen, rasismen och det mångkulturella samhället*. Nora, Nya Doxa.
- Moraña, M., Dussel, E. and Jáuregui, C. A. (eds) (2008) *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Morgan, N. and Cole, S. (eds) (2010) *Tourism and Inequality - Problems and Prospects*. London: CABI Publishing.
- Morrow and Torres (2002) *Reading Freire and Habermas: critical pedagogy and transformative social change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Morton, S. (2007) Gayatri Spivak. Ethics, Subalternity and the Critique of the Postcolonial Reason. Cambridge MA: Polity.
- Moscardo, G. (2008) 'Community Capacity Building: an Emerging Challenge for Tourism Development', in G. Moscardo (ed.) *Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development*. Oxfordshire: CABI, pp. 1-16.
- Moscardo, G., Blackman, A. and Murphy, L. (2014) 'Tourism Development as Greek Tragedy: Implications for Tourism Development Policy and Education'. Paper presented in BEST EN Think Tank XIV entitled, "Politics, Policy and Governance in Sustainable Tourism", at the Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, 24 June 2014.
- Mostafanezhad, M. (2013) *Sentimental Sojourns: Volunteer Tourism and Popular Humanitarianism in a Neoliberal Era*. London: Ashgate Press.
- Mostafanezhad, M. and Hannam, K. eds (2014) *Moral Encounters in Tourism*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Mowforth, M and Munt, I (1998) *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Mowforth, M and Munt, I (2003) *Tourism and Sustainability. Development and New Tourism in the Third World. Second Edition*. London: Routledge.
- Mowforth, M., Charlton, C, and Munt I. (2008) *Tourism and Responsibility. Perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean*. London: Routledge.
- Müller, D. K. and Jansson, B. (eds) (2007) *Tourism in Peripheries: Perspectives from the Far North and South*. Oxfordshire: CABI.
- Murchison, J.M. (2010) *Ethnography Essentials: Designing, Conducting, and Presenting Your Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, P.E. (1985) *Tourism: a community approach*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy, P.E. and Murphy (2004) *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities: Bridging the Gaps*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

- Naas, M. (2008) *Derrida from now on*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Närman, A. (2006) 'Paolo Freire', in D. Simon (ed.), *Fifty Key thinkers of development*. London: Routledge.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2001) *Development Theory: Deconstructions/Reconstructions*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nelson, N. and Wright, S. (1997) 'Participation and Power', in N. Nelson and S. Wright (eds), *Power and Participatory development: Theory and Practice*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications, pp. 1-18.
- New York Times (2013) 'The 46 Places to Go in 2013. Whether you travel to eat or shop, surf or ski, new adventures await', Article published in 11 January, 2013.
- Nkyi, E. and Hashimoto, A. (2014) 'Human Rights Issues in Tourism Development', in R. Sharpley and D.J. Telfer (eds) *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues*, 2nd Edition. Bristol: Channel View Publication, pp. 378-399.
- Noblit, G. W., Flores, S. Y., and Murillo, E. G. (2004) *Postcritical ethnography: An introduction*. Cress, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Nousiainen, J. (2014) 'Moniulotteinen vieraanvaraisuus' [Multidimensional hospitality], in O. Rantala and M. Hakkarainen (eds) *Omaleimaista palvelualltiutta. Inari-Saariselän matkailutoimijoiden käsityksiä vieraanvaraisuudesta*. Tampere: Juvenes Print, pp. 12-21.
- Nousiainen, J. (2015) *Vieraanvaraisuuden käsitteellisiä ja paikallisia ulottuvuuksia. Mistä on lappilainen vieraanvaraisuutus tehty –selvityshankkeen raportti* [Conceptual and local dimensions of hospitality]. Tampere: Juvenes Print.
- Nygren, A. (1999) 'Local Knowledge in the Environment- Development Discourse. From Dichotomies to Situated Knowledges', *Critique of Anthropology*. 19:3, 267– 288.
- Nykänen, T. and Veijola, S. (2013) 'Matkailun Etiikka' [Ethics in Tourism], in S. Veijola (ed.) *Matkailututkimuksen lukukirja*. Rovaniemi: Lapin Yliopistokustannus, pp. 87-100.
- O'Gorman, K.D. (2007) Discovering commercial hospitality in ancient Rome, *Hospitality Review*, 9:2, 44-52.
- O'Gorman, K.D. (2010) *The Origins of Hospitality and Tourism*, Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers Limited.
- Oksala, J. (2001) 'Järjen ja tahdon tuolla puolen. Etiikan mahdoton subjekti' [Beyond understanding and will. The impossibility of a subject in ethics], in S. Heinämaa and J. Oksala. *Rakkaudesta toiseen: kirjoituksia vuositutkannan vaihteen etiikasta*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus Kirja.
- Olam (2013) Coffee Report. Briefing note 1 – January 2013, La Roya. http://www.olamspecialtycoffee.com/index.php/downloads/dl/file/id/36/la_roya_briefing_note_olam_coffee_jan_2013.pdf.
- Olsen, B. (1997) 'Environmentally Sustainable Development and Tourism: Lessons from Negril, Jamaica', *Human Organization*, 56:3, 285-293.
- Page, S., and Dowling, R.K. (2002) *Ecotourism*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

- Pakkasvirta, J. (2010) Policies and Practices of Tourism Industry: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary Study on Central America. Research proposal for the Academy of Finland. 1-16.
- Pakkasvirta, J. and Quesada, F. (2007) Situation of Social Science research in Central America. An Overview. Published by Sida, Edita Communication.
- Pakkasvirta, J. and Teivainen, T. (eds) (1992) *Kenen Amerikka? 500 vuotta Latinalaisen AmerikanValloitusta*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 23-45.
- Pakkasvirta, Jussi (2005) ¿Un continente, una nación? *Intelectuales latinoamericanos, comunidad política y las revistas culturales en Costa Rica y en el Perú (1919-1930)*. San José: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica.
- Palmer, S. (1988) 'Carlos Fonseca and the Construction of Sandinismo in Nicaragua', *Latin American Research Review*, XXIII:1, 100-121
- Palomo Pérez, S. (2003) *El Turismo y la cooperación internacional al desarrollo*. Fuengirola, Malaga.
- Panosso Netto, A. (2009) 'What is Tourism? Definitions, Theoretical Phases and Principles', in J. Tribe (ed) *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*, Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 43-61.
- Parry, B. (2004) *Postcolonial Studies: A Materialist Critique*. London: Routledge
- Pattison, H. (2013) 'Picturing Tourism: Conceptualizing the Gambian Host Gaze through Photographs', in O. Moufakkir and Y. Reisinger (eds) *The Host Gaze in Global Tourism*. Oxfordshire: CABI, pp. 93-110.
- Pearce, P.L., Moscardo, G. and Ross, G.F. (1996) 'Tourism community relationships', *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Published online in 2002, 4:2, 153-154.
- PEMCE (2008) *Estudio de cadena de valor, Turismo rural en Nicaragua*. August 2008. DFID and UNOPS, Managua, Nicaragua.
- Peperzac, A.T. (ed.) (1995) *Ethics as First Philosophy: The Significance of Emmanuel Levinas for Philosophy, Literature and Religion*. New York: Routledge.
- Pérez, F. P., Barrera. O. P., Peláez, A. V. and Lorío, G. (2010) *Turismo Rural Comunitario como Alternativa de reducción de la pobreza rural en Centroamérica*. Managua: EDITASA.
- Pernecky, T. and Jamal T. (2010) '(Hermeneutic) Phenomenology in Tourism Studies', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37, 1055-1075.
- Phillimore, J. and Goodson, L. (eds) (2004) *Qualitative Methods in Tourism Research*. London: Routledge Press.
- Phommavong, S. (2011) *International Tourism Development and Poverty Reduction in Lao PDR*, University of Umeå.
- Piffa, P.K., Stancatoa, D.M., Côté, S. Mendoza-Dentona, R. and Keltnera, D. (2011) 'Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior', in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109:11, 4086-4091.
- Pleumarom, A. (2012) 'The Politics of Tourism and Poverty Reduction', in D. Leslie (ed.) *Responsible Tourism: Concepts, theory and Practice*. CABI: Oxfordshire.

- Plog, S.C. (1991) *Leisure Travel: Making it a Growth Market...Again*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Plunkett, H. (2007) *Nicaragua in Focus: A Guide to the People, Politics and Culture*. Interlink Publishing Group.
- PNDH (2008) Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Humano 2008–2012. Managua Nicaragua.
- PNDH (2012) Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Humano 2012–2016. Managua Nicaragua.
- Popple, K. (2000) *Analysing Community Work, Its Theory and Practise*. Oxfordshire: Marston Lindsay Ross International Ltd.
- Porta, D.D. and Keating, M. (eds) (2008) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University press.
- Potts, T.D. and Harrill, R. (1998) 'Enhancing communities for sustainability: A travel ecology approach', *Tourism Analysis*, 3, 133–142.
- Pratt, M.L. (1986) 'Fieldwork in common places', in J. Clifford and E.G. Marcus (eds) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pratt, M.L. (1992) *Imperial Eyes Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Preston, P. (1996) *Development Theory: An Introduction to the Analysis of Complex Change*. Blackwell: Wiley.
- Pretty, Jules, N. (1995) *Regenerating Agriculture. Policies and Practice for Sustainability and Self-Reliance*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N. and Ateljevich, I. (2011) 'Hopeful Tourism, A New Transformative Perspective', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38:3, 941– 963.
- PRONicaragua (2014) Doing Business in Nicaragua, Guía del Inversionista. PRONicaragua in cooperation with AMCHAM and MIFIC. <http://pronicaragua.org/es/component/k2/item/326-doing-business-2014-2015>
- PRONicaragua (2015) Country Presentation: Nicaragua, let's grow together. http://pronicaragua.org/images/resource_library/Presentacin%20Pas%202015.pdf
- Pyyhtinen, O. (2009) 'Being- with: Georg Simmel's Sociology of Association', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 26, 108–128.
- Pyyhtinen, O. (2014) *The Gift and its Paradoxes. Beyond Mauss*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Quesada, Florencia (2014) 'Sustainable Tourism Planning, and the Demolition Conflict in the South Caribbean Coasta Area of Costa Rica', in H. Balslev Clausen, S. Gyimóthy and V. Andersson (eds) *Global Mobilities and Tourism Development; A Community Perspective*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press, pp. 19–43.
- Raffoul, F. (1998) 'The Subject of the Welcome. On Jacques Derrida's Adieu á Emmanuel Levinas', *Symposium*, 2:2, 211–222.
- Raffoul, F. (2010) *The Origins of Responsibility*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press.
- Raffoul, F. (2014) 'The Question of Responsibility between Levinas and Heidegger', in J.E. Drabinski and E.S. Eric, S. (eds) *Between Levinas and Heidegger*. Albany NY: SUNY Press.
- Ramirez, S. (1985) *Estás En Nicaragua*. Barcelona: Muchnik.

- Ramirez, Sergio (2011) *Adios muchachos: A Memoir of the Sandinista Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ranta, E.M. (2014) *In the Name of Vivir Bien. Indigeneity, state formation, and politics in Evo Morales' Bolivia*. Helsinki: Helsinki: Unigrafia.
- Rantala O. (2011b) 'An Ethnographic Approach to Nature-based Tourism', *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 11:2, 150-165.
- Rantala, O. (2011a) *Metsä Matkailukäytössä. Etnografinen tutkimus luonnossa opastamisesta*. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Rantala, O. and Valtonen, A. (2014) 'A Rhythmanalysis of Touristic Sleep in Nature', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 47, 18– 30.
- Ranta-Owusu, E. (2010) 'Governing Pluralities in the Making. Indigenous Knowledge and the Question of Sovereignty in Contemporary Bolivia', in *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society*. 35:3, 28-48.
- Reid, D. Mair, H. and George, W. (2004) 'Community tourism planning: A self assessment instrument', *Annals of Tourism Research* 31:3, 623–639.
- Reis, A. (2011), 'Bringing my creative self to the fore: accounts of a reflexive research endeavour', *Creative Approaches to Research*, 1:1, 2–18.
- Ren, C., A. Pritchard and N. Morgan (2010), 'Constructing tourism research: a critical inquiry', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37:4, 885–904.
- Replogle, J. (2014) 'Why Nicaraguan Kids Aren't Fleeing To U.S.?' <http://www.kpbs.org/news/2014/jul/29/why-nicaraguan-kids-arent-fleeing-to-the-us/>
- Richards, G. and Hall, D. (2006) 'Conclusions', in D. Hall, and G. Richards (ed.), *Tourism and sustainable community development*. London: Routledge, pp. 297–306.
- Richards, G. and Hall, D. (2006) 'The community: a sustainable concept in tourism development?', in D. Hall and G. Richards (ed.), *Tourism and sustainable community development*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–14.
- Richter, L. K. (2001) 'Lessons of Philippine tourism Development', in V.L. Smith, and M. Brent (eds), *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st century*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Riddell, R.C. (2008) *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rivas Choza, E. (2008) *San Ramon Indigena y Fertil*. Matagalpa: Publitec.
- Rocha, J. L. (2008) 'Esplendor y Miserias del Ecoturismo Nacional', *Envio, Revista Mensual de la Universidad Centroamericana (UCA) Managua*, 318, 3-13.
- Ronkainen, S. (1999) *Ajan ja paikan merkitsemät. Subjektivoiteetti, tieto ja toimijuus*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Ronkainen, S. (2004) 'Kvantitatiivisuus, tulkinnallisuus ja feministinen tutkimus', in M. Liljeström (ed.), *Feministinen tietäminen: Keskustelua metodologiasta*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ronkainen, S., Pehkonen, L. and Lindblom-Ylänne, S. (2011) *Tutkimuksen voimasanat*. Helsinki: SanomaPro.
- Rosello, M. (2001) *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Ross, S. and Wall, G. (1999) 'Ecotourism: Towards Congruence between Theory and Practice', *Tourism Management*, 20, 122-132
- Saarinen, J. (2004) 'Viimeinen oljenkorsi? Matkailu ja maaseudun aluekehitys', *Maaseudun Uusi Aika*, 12:3, 26-38.
- Saarinen, J. (2006) 'Traditions of Sustainability in Tourism Studies', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33:4, 1121-1140.
- Saarinen, J. (2010) 'Local tourism awareness: Community views in Katutura and King Nehale Conservancy, Namibia', *Development Southern Africa*, 27: 5, 713-724.
- Saarinen, J., Rogerson, C. and H. Manwa (2012), 'Tourism, Poverty Reduction and the Millennium Development Goals: Perspectives and Debates', in J. Saarinen, C. Rogerson and H. Manwa (eds), *Tourism and Millennium Development Goals: Tourism, Local Communities and Development*. London: Routledge, pp.1-12.
- Sachs, W. (1992) *The Development Dictionary*. London: Zed Books.
- Salazar, N.B. (2010) *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Salazar, N.B. (2012a) 'Community-based Cultural Tourism: Issues, threats and opportunities', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 20:1, 9-22.
- Salazar, N.B. (2012b) 'Tourism imaginaries: A conceptual approach', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39, 863-882.
- Salazar, N.B. (2013) 'Imagineering otherness: Anthropological legacies in contemporary tourism', *Anthropological Quarterly* 86:3, 669-696.
- Salazar, N.B. (2014) 'Seduction: Learning to Trade of Tourist Enticement', in D. Picard and M.A. Giovine (eds), *Tourism and the Power of Otherness. Seductions of Difference*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 110-123.
- Sammels, C.A. (2014) 'Bargaining Under Thatcher Roofs: Tourism and the Allure of Poverty in Highland Bolivia', in D. Picard and M.A. Giovine (eds), *Tourism and the Power of Otherness. Seductions of Difference*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 124-140.
- Santovenia Pérez, C. (no date) Presentation of Sistema de calidad del turismo rural comunitario [Quality system of rural community-based tourism], in Foro Latinoamericano de Turismo Rural Comunitario, (Symposium for rural community-based tourism), 28-30 August 2008 in Catarina, Nicaragua.
- Saxena, N.C. (1998) 'What is meant by people's participation?', *Journal of Rural Development*, 17:1, 111-113.
- Saxena, N.C. (2011) 'What is meant by people's participation,' in A. Cornwall (ed.) *The Participation Reader*, London: Zed Books.
- Scheyvens, R. (1999) 'Case Study. Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities', *Tourism Management*, 20, 245-249.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002) *Tourism for Development: Empowering Communities*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Scheyvens, R. (2003) 'Local involvement in managing tourism', in T. Singh, J.T. Dallen, & R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 229-252.

- Scheyvens, R. (2007) 'Poor cousins no more valuing the development potential of domestic and diaspora tourism', *Progress in Development Studies* 7:4, 307–325.
- Scheyvens, R. (2011) *Tourism and Poverty*. London: Routledge.
- Scheyvens, R. and Storey, D. (2003) 'Introduction', in R. Scheyvens (ed.), *Development Fieldwork: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage Publications.
- Schilcher, D. (2007) 'Growth versus equity: The continuum of pro-poor tourism and neoliberal governance', in M. Hall (ed.), *Pro-poor tourism: Who benefits? Perspectives on tourism and poverty reduction*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, pp. 57–83.
- Schyst Resande (2015) Travelife's broken promises to hotel workers. A study of labour rights at hotels in Turkey contracted by Apollo (Kuoni), Fritidsresor (TUI) and Ving (Thomas Cook).
- SECTUR / Moderniza: Programa de calidad, para la micro, pequeña y mediana empresa turística. <http://www.sectur.gob.mx/sub/revistas/CertificacionTuristica/Moderniza/#libro/>, Website accessed 14 August 2015.
- Sen, A. (1999) *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seppälä, T. (2013) 'Hallintaa, vastarintaa ja uusliberaalia kehityspolitiikkaa Etelä-Aasiassa' [Governance, Resistance and Neoliberal Development in South-Asia]. *AGON, Northern Philosopher's Association*, 39, 11–13.
- Seppälä, T., Laako H. Junka-Aikio, L. (2014) 'Pääkirjoitus: Maailmanpolitiikan marginaalit: Tieto, valta, kritiikki' [Editorial: The Margins of World Politics: Knowledge, Power, Critique], in Bordering Actors (ed.) *Maailmanpolitiikan marginaalit: Tieto, valta, kritiikki* [The Margins of World Politics: Knowledge, Power, Critique]. *Kosmopolis: Peace, Conflict and World Politics Journal*, 44:3–8.
- Serres, Michel (2007) *The Parasite*, translated by L.R. Schehr. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sharpe J. and Spivak, G. C. (2002) 'A Conversation with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: Politics and the Imagination', *Signs*, 28:2, 609–624.
- Sharpley, R. (2011) *The study of tourism. Past Trends and Future Directions*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Sharpley, R. (2014) 'Tourism: A Vehicle for Development?', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues, 2nd Edition*. Clevedon: Channel View, pp. 3–30.
- Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D.J. (2014) 'Introduction: Tourism and Development: A Decade of Change', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues, 2nd Edition*. Clevedon: Channel View, pp. xi–xvii.
- Shen, F. Hughey, K. and Simmons, D. (2008) 'Conneting the Sustainable Livelihoods approach and Tourism: a Review of the Literature Towards Integrative Thinking'. Research paper presented in Cauthe 2008 Conference: "Where the Bloody Hell Are We?". Lincoln University, New Zealand.
- Simmons, B.A. (2004) 'Saying the same old things. A contemporary travel discourse and the popular magazine text', in C.M. Hall and H. Tucker (eds), *Tourism and Post-colonialism: Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations*. London: Routledge.

- Simpson, M. (2008) 'Community benefit tourism initiatives: A conceptual oxymoron?', *Tourism Management* 29:1, 1-18.
- Singh, S. (2012) 'Community Participation – In Need of a Fresh Perspective', in T. V Singh (ed.), *Critical Debates in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 113-117.
- Singh, T., Dallen, J.T., Dowling, R.K. eds (2003) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing.
- Sklar, H. (1988) *Washington's War on Nicaragua*, Cambridge MA: South End Press.
- Smith, M. (2009a) 'Development and its Discontents: Ego-tripping Without Ethics or Idea(l)s?', in J. Tribe (ed.), *Philosophical issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel view Publications, pp. 261-277.
- Smith, M. (2009b) 'Ethical Perspectives: Exploring the Ethical Landscape of Tourism', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 613– 630.
- Smith, M. and Duffy, R. (2003) *The Ethics of Tourism Development*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Smith, M.K. (2009) *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies, Second Edition*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Smith, V.L. ed. (1977/1989) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia PN: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- SNV* (2007) Linea base de Renitural.com. Servicio Holandes de Cooperación al Desarrollo (SNV). Managua, Nicaragua.
- Spivak, G. C. (1987) *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988) 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271– 313.
- Spivak, G. C. (1995) 'Translator's Preface and Afterword', in *Imaginary Maps: Three Stories*. London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2001) 'A Note on the New International', *Parallax*, 7:3, 12– 16.
- Spivak, G.C. (1990) *The Postcolonial Critic: Interviews Strategies, Dialogue*. London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G.C. (1994) 'Responsibility', *Boundary 1*, 21:3, 19-64.
- Stiefel, M. and Wolfe, M. (1994/2011) 'The Many Faces of Participation', in A. Cornwall (ed.), *The Participation Reader*. London: Zed Books.
- Still, J. (2006) 'France and the Paradigm of Hospitality', *Third Text*, 20:6, 703–710.
- Still, J. (2010) *Derrida and Hospitality: theory and practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Strasdas, W. Corcoran, B. and Petermann, T. (2007) 'Capacity-Building for Ecotourism: Training Programmes for Managers of Protected Areas', in R. Bushell and P. Eagles (eds), *Tourism and Protected Areas: Benefits Beyond Boundaries: the Vth IUCN World Parks Congress*. Oxfordshire: CABI, pp. 150-167.
- Strhan, A. (2012) *Levinas, Subjectivity, Education. Towards an Ethics of Radical Responsibility*. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

- Suvantola, J. (2002) *Tourist's Experience of Place*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Svanberg, J. (2014) *Varför kom du hit?* Mänpocket, Stockholm.
- Swarbrooke, John (2002) *Sustainable Tourism Management*. Oxon: CABI Publishing.
- Taylor, G. (1995) 'The community approach: Does it really work?', *Tourism Management*, 16:7, 487–489.
- Teivainen, T. (1998) 'Suomen läitinalaisamerikkalaistuminen ja yhdessä oppimisen haasteet' [Latinamericatization of Finland and the challenges of learning together], in J. Pakkasvirta and J. Aronen (eds), *Kabvi, pabvi ja tango. Suomen ja Latinalaisen Amerikan subteet* [Relations between Finland and Latin America]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Teivainen, T. (2004) *Pedagogia del poder mundial*. INTO eBooks.
- Teivainen, T. (2014) 'Vasemistohallitukset 2000-luvun Latinalaisessa Amerikassa' [Leftist Governments in Latin America in the 21st century], in H. Kettunen and E. Vuola (eds), *Latinalainen Amerikka: Ihmiset kulttuuri ja yhteiskunta* [Latin America: people, culture and society]. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 246–263.
- Telfer, D.J. (2002) 'The Evolution of Tourism and Development Theory'. in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and development. Concepts and issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, pp. 35–77.
- Telfer, D.J. (2003) 'Development issues in Destination Communities', in T. Singh, J.T. Dallen & R.K. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 155–180.
- Telfer, D.J. (2009) 'Development Studies and Tourism', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 504–520.
- Telfer, D.J. (2014) 'The Evolution of Development Theory in Tourism', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*, 2nd Edition. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 31–76.
- Telfer, D.J. and Hashimoto, A. (2014) 'Tourism, Development and International Studies', in R. Sharpley and D. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*, 2nd Edition. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 400–427.
- Telfer, D.J. and Sharpley, R. (eds) (2008) *Tourism and development in the developing world*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Telfer, E. (2000) 'The Philosophy of Hospitality', in C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds) *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 38–55.
- Terazono, E. (2013) 'Coffee fungus threatens disaster for Central America's farmers', in *Financial Times*, July 14 2013.
- Thomas, J. (1993) *Doing Critical Ethnography*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Thulemark, M., Lundmark, M. and Heldt-Cassel, S. (2014) 'Tourism Employment and Creative In-migrants' *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14:4, 403–421.
- Tiller, T. R. (2014) 'Can "Slow Travel" Contribute to Sustainable Tourism?', Research paper presented in BEST EN Think Tank XIV entitled, "Politics, Policy and Governance in Sustainable Tourism", at the Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, 24 June 2014.

- Timothy, D. and Tosun, C. (2003) 'Appropriate Planning for tourism in destination communities: Participation, incremental growth and collaboration', in S. Singh, D. Timothy and R. Dowling (eds) *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 181–204.
- Timothy, D.J. (2002) 'Tourism and Community Development issues', in R. Sharpley and D.J. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, pp. 147–164.
- Tlostanova, M. and Mignolo, W.D. (2012) *Learning to Unlearn. Decolonial relections from Eurasia and the Americas*. Ohio, Ohio University Press.
- Todaro, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2006) *Economic Development*. Essex: Pearson Limited.
- Todorov, T. (1984) *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, translated by R. Howard. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Tökkäri, V. (2010) 'Ihmiseksi osallistumalla' [Becoming a human though participation] Teoksessa J. Perttula, A. Pietiläinen, T. Salonen, E. Sorjonen and V. Tökkäri, *Ihmistyminen: subteisuusteoreettisia punoksia*. Rovaniemi: Lapin yliopistokustannus, 30–41.
- Tosun, C. (2000) 'Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries', *Tourism Management* 21:6, 613–633.
- Tosun, C. (2005) 'Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the Developing World', *Geoforum*, 36:3, pp. 333–352.
- Tribe, J. (2004) 'Knowing about tourism: epistemological issues', in J. Phillimore and L. Goodson (eds), *Qualitative Research in Tourism: Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies*, London: Routledge, pp. 46–62.
- Tribe, J. (2006) 'The truth about tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33:2, 360–381.
- Tribe, J. ed. (2009) *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Trousdale, W. J. (2001) 'Appropriate Tourism Impact Assessment: A Case Study of Kaniki Point Resort, Palawan, Philippines', in V.L. Smith and M. Brent (eds), *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st century*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Tucker, H. (2003) *Living with Tourism: Negotiating Identities in a Turkish Village*. London: Routledge.
- Tucker, H. (2007), 'Undoing shame: tourism and women's work in Turkey', *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 5:2, 87–105.
- Tucker, H. (2009) 'Recognizing emotion and its postcolonial potentialities: Discomfort and shame in a tourism encounter in Turkey', *Tourism Geographies*, 11:4, 444–461.
- Tucker, H. (2010) 'Peasant entrepreneurs: A longitudinal ethnography', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37:4, 927–946.
- Tucker, H. (2014) 'Mind the Gap: Opening up Spaces of Multiple Moralities in Tourism Encounters', in M. Mostafanezhad and K. Hannam (eds) *Moral Encounters in Tourism*. Surrey: Ashgate, pp. 199–208.
- Tucker, H., and Akama, J. (2009) 'Tourism as postcolonialism', in T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds) *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 504–520.

- Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (2012) *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. Second Edition*. London: ZED BOOKS.
- Turnbull, David (1991) 'Local Knowledge and "Absolute Standards": A Reply to Daly', *Social Studies of Science* 21:3, 571–3.
- Turner, L. and Ash, J. (1976) *The golden horses*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Tuulentie, S. and Mettinen, I. (2007) 'Local participation in the evolution of ski resorts: the case of Ylläs and Levi in Finnish Lapland', *Forest, Snow and Landscape Research*, 81:1/2, 207–222.
- Tuulentie, S. and Sarkki, S. (2009) 'Kun kylästä tulee keskus' [When village turns into tourism destination], in S. Tuulentie (ed.), *Turisti tulee kylään. Matkailukeskukset ja lappilainen arki*. Helsinki: Minerva Kustannus Oy, pp. 9–28.
- UCA San Ramón (2008) Project Document 13th of May 2008 'Convocatoria Especial 2008: Agencia Luxemburguesa de cooperación, Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo – Programa de Pequeñas Donaciones (PPD)'. San Ramón, Nicaragua.
- UNWTO (2004) *Making Tourism More Sustainable: A Guide for Policy Makers*. Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization, UNWTO.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- Vainikka, V. (2013) 'Rethinking mass tourism', *Tourist Studies*, 13:3, 268–286.
- Vakis, R., Kruger, D., and Mason A. (2004) Shocks and Coffee: Lessons from Nicaragua. Social Protection Discussion Paper Series No. 0415. Washington: The World Bank.
- Valkila J. and Nygren A. (2009) *Impacts of Fair Trade certification on coffee farmers, cooperatives and laborers in Nicaragua*. Agriculture and Human Value.
- Valkila, J. (2009) 'Fair Trade organic coffee production in Nicaragua — Sustainable development or a poverty trap?' *Ecological Economics*, 68:12, 3018–3025.
- Valkonen, J. and Veijola S. eds (2008) *Töissä tunturissa. Ajatuksia ja kirjoituksia matkailutyöstä*. [Work at Fell] Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Valkonen, J., Lehtonen, T.-K. and Pyyhtinen, O. (2013) Sosiologista materiaalioppia. [Sociological Materiology.] *Sociologia*, 50:3, 217–221.
- Valtonen, A. (2009) 'Small Tourism Firms as Agents of Critical Knowledge. Tourist Studies', 9:2, 127–143.
- Valtonen, A. and Veijola, S. (2011) 'Sleep in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38:1, 175– 192.
- van Broek, A.-M. (2002) 'The (Missing) Gender Dimension: A Review of Tourism Literature on Latin America and the Caribbean', in H. Dahles and L. Keune (eds), *Tourism Development and Local Participation in Latin America*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation, pp. 130–152.
- van der Duim, R.; Peters, K and Akama J. (2006) 'Cultural tourism in African communities: A Comparison Between Cultural Manyattas in Kenya and Cultural Tourism Project in Tansania', in M.K. Smith and M. Robinson (eds), *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World, Politics, Participation and (re)presentation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

- van Manen, M. (1990) *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- Veijola, S. (1994) 'Metaphors of Mixed Team Play', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 29:1, 32– 49.
- Veijola, S. (1999) 'Tourism as a Violent Narrative? Epistemological and Methodological Inquiries', an invited paper at the Second Annual Colloquium of the Centre for the Study of Spaces in Modernity, Mobilities. 26–28 November 1999, in Gregonyg, Newtown, Powys, Wales.
- Veijola, S. (2003) 'Sosiologian esitysopimukset' [Contracts of Performance in Sociology], Sosiologin valta – Sosiologiapäivien yleisesitelmät (28–29.3.2003) [The Power of Sociology – The Keynote Talks at the Annual meeting of Finnish Sociology]. *Sosiologia-lehti* 2, 122–126.
- Veijola, S. (2005) 'Turistien yhteisöt' [Tourist Communities], in A. Hautamäki, T. Lehtonen, J. Sihvola, I. Tuomi, H. Vaaranen and Veijola, S. (eds), *Yhteisöllisyyden paluu* [The Return of Communitality], Helsinki: Gaudeamus, pp. 90– 113.
- Veijola, S. (2006) 'Heimat Tourism in the Countryside. Paradoxical Sojourns in Self and Place', in T. Oakes and C. Minca (eds), *Travels in Paradox: Remapping Tourism*. New York: Bowman and Littlefield, pp. 77– 95.
- Veijola, S. (2009) 'Gender As Work in the Tourism Industry', *Tourist Studies*, 9:2, 109–126.
- Veijola, S. (2014) 'Towards Silent Communities', in S. Veijola, J. Germann Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert and A. Grit, *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 68–95.
- Veijola, S. (no date) Paneeli, Helsinki Declaration. Matkalla on kasvot – Social Journey. Matkailumessut, 18 January 2013.
- Veijola, S. and Falin, P. (2014) 'Mobile Neighbouring', *Mobilities*, 11.3.
- Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (1994) 'The Body in Tourism', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 11:3, 125–151.
- Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (1998) 'The Death of the Tourist', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1:3, 327– 351.
- Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (2008) 'Towards a Hostessing Society? Mobile Arrangements of Gender and Labour', *NORA: Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 16:3, 166– 181.
- Veijola, S., Germann Molz, J., Pyyhtinen, O., Höckert, E. and Grit, A. (2014) *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests. Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Veijola, S., Ilola, H., and Edenheim, J. (2013) 'Johdanto matkailun tukimukseen' [Introduction to tourism research], in S. Veijola (ed.), *Matkailututkimuksen lukukirja*. Rovaniemi: Lapin Yliopistokustannus, pp. 16–29.
- Vennesson, P. (2008) 'Case studies and process tracing: theories and practices', in D.D. Porta and M. Keating (eds), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

- Vianica (no date) 'Rural tourism at the la Pita community' URL: <http://www.vianica.com/activity/118/rural-tourism-at-the-la-pita-community>.
- Vihemäki, H. (2009) *Participation or Further Exclusion? Contestations over forest conservation and control in the East Usambara Mountains, Tanzania*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Viswanath, R. (2008) 'Can we transform tourism?', in C. D'Mello (ed.), *Transforming Re-forming Tourism, Perspectives on Justice and Humanity in Tourism*. Ecumenial Coalition on Tourism, Thailand.
- Vrasti, W. (2010) 'Dr Strangelove or How I learned to Stop Worrying about methodology and Love Writing', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 39:1, 79-88.
- Vrasti, W. (2013) *Volunteer Tourism in the Global South. Giving back in neoliberal times*. London: Routledge.
- Wall, G. (2001) Consequences of Tourism, in G. Wall (ed.) *Contemporary perspectives on Tourism*. Ontario: University of Waterloo.
- Wall, G. and Mathieson, A. (2006) *Tourism: Change, Impacts, and Opportunities. 2nd edition*. Harlow: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Wearing, Betsy (1998) *Leisure and Feminist Theory*. London: Sage.
- Wearing, S. (2001) *Volunteer Tourism: Experiences that make difference*. New York: CABI.
- Wearing, S. and Darcy, S. (2011) 'Inclusion of the 'othered' in tourism', *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Journal*, 3:2, 18 -34.
- Wearing, S. and McDonald, M. (2002) 'The development of community-based tourism: Re-thinking the relationships between tour operators and development agents as intermediaries in rural and isolated area communities', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10:2, 31-45.
- Wearing, S. and Wearing, M. (1999) 'Decommodifying Ecotourism: Rethinking Global-local interactions with Host Communities', *Leisure and Society*, 22:1, 39-70.
- Wearing, S. and Wearing, M. (2014) 'On Decommodifying Ecotourism's Social Value: Neoliberal Reformism or the New Environmental Morality?', in M. Mostafanezhad and K. Hannam (eds), *Moral Encounters in Tourism*. Surrey: Ashgate, pp. 123-138.
- Wearing, S., Deville, A.M. and Lyons, K. (2008) 'The volunteer's journey through leisure into the self' in K.D. Lyons and S.L. Wearing (eds), *Journeys of Discovery in Volunteer Tourism*. Oxfordshire: CABI, pp. 63-71.
- Weaver, D. (2012) 'Community-based Tourism as Strategic Dead-End', in T.V. Singh (ed.), *Critical Debates in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 109-112.
- Wild, J. (1969) 'Introduction', in E. Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh PS: Duquesne University Press.
- Wild, J. (2008) 'Tourism and the Millennium Development Goals', in C. D'Mello (ed.), *Transforming Re-forming Tourism, Perspectives on Justice and Humanity in Tourism*. Thailand: Ecumenial Coalition on Tourism.
- Wilson, S. (2014) 'To Boldly Go Where No Van Has gone Before: Auto-Ethnographic Experimentation and Mobile Fieldwork', in M. Mostafanezhad and K. Hannam (eds), *Moral Encounters in Tourism*. Surrey: Ashgate, pp. 221-234.

- Wood, R. (2000) 'Caribbean Cruise tourism: Globalisation at sea', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27:2, 345-370.
- Woods, T. (1997) 'The ethical subject: the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas', in K. Simms (eds), *Ethics and the Subject*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 53-60.
- Wyllie, R. (1998) 'Hana revisited: development and controversy in a Hawaiian tourism community', *Tourism Management*, 19:2, 171-178.
- Young, G. (1973) *Tourism: Blessing or Blight?*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Zapata, M.J., Hall, C., Lindo, P. and Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011) 'Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14:8, 725-749.
- Zoomers, A. (2008) 'Global Travelling Along the Inca Route: Is International Tourism Beneficial for Local Development?', *European Planning Studies*, 16:7, 971-983.
- Zorn, E. and Farthing, L. (2007) 'Communitarian tourism hosts and mediators in Peru', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34:3, 673-689.

Appendix 1. The Maps of Nicaragua and San Ramón¹



1 Origin: Google maps, websites accessed 12 September 2015.

Appendix 2. Interviews by the year and category of interviewees including the number of individual and group interviews and gender (female/male) aggregated data.

Category of interviewees	Number of individual interviews (f/m)	Number of group interviews (number of f/m)	Number of interviews, total
2008			
People living in the communities of San Ramón	15 (12/3)	6 (9/9)	21
Local tourism coordinators and developers in San Ramón		1 (1/2)	1
2011-2012			
People living in the communities of San Ramón & local tourism coordinators		1 Participatory workshop in San Ramón (7/7)	1
Representatives and functionaries of international development organizations	6 (5/1)		6
Representatives and functionaries of Nicaraguan tourism organizations	3 (2/1)		3
INTUR, public servants and consultants	4 (3/1)		4
2013			
People living in the communities of San Ramón	11 (7/5)	1 (2/0)	12
Local tourism coordinators and developers in San Ramón	3 (3/0)		3
Representatives and functionaries of international development organizations	2 (1/1)		2
INTUR, public servants and consultants	2 (2/0)		2
Total	46	9	55